DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 355 757 FL 020 601

AUTHOR Riley-Mundine, Lynette; Roberts, Bryn
TITLE Review of National Aboriginal Languages Program. Occasional Paper Number 5.
INSTITUTION Australian Advisory Council on Languages and Multicultural Education, Canberra.
PUB DATE Mar 90
NOTE 117p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Australian Aboriginal Languages; *Cultural Awareness; *Curriculum Development; Foreign Countries; *Indigenous Populations; Instructional Materials; Language Research; *Language Role; Material Development; National Programs; *Native Language Instruction; Policy Formation; Program Descriptions; Program Design; Program Evaluation; Program Implementation; Public Policy; Resource Allocation; Uncommonly Taught Languages
IDENTIFIERS *Australia; National Aboriginal Languages Program (Australia)

ABSTRACT

This review of Australia's National Aboriginal Languages Program, undertaken in September-November 1989, involved consultation with individuals in Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal organizations and communities in several areas. It was found that 56% of 1988-89 funding went to Aboriginal communities and regional language centers, 20% to state schools, 5% to independent aboriginal schools, 2% to Catholic schools, and the remainder to institutions, private companies, and individuals. The program currently assists 91 Aboriginal languages, with over 5,000 people benefitting directly or indirectly. Achievements, still in the early stages at the time of the review, included educational and linguistic materials development, greater teacher recognition of student difficulties, increased student pride in language learning and community support for related projects, better student retention, greater opportunities for cross-cultural learning, and greater appreciation of Aboriginal language and culture. Problems included funding and resource allocation difficulties, staffing shortfalls, inadequate awareness and school administrative support in some cases, differential quality and quantity of materials developed, lack of appropriate public policy, and administrative organization. Proposals are made for Aboriginal language policy, regional representation, additional regional language centers, funding, community involvement, curriculum development, staff training, and research. Program data and descriptions and notes on the study's methodology are appended. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED355757

ACLAME

REVIEW OF NATIONAL ABORIGINAL LANGUAGES PROGRAM

Lynette Riley - Mundine

Bryn Roberts

AACLAME OCCASIONAL PAPER NO. 5

MARCH 1990

Flooded

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Joseph LoBianco

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC).

This work is copyright. Apart from any use as permitted under the Copyright Act 1968, no part may be reproduced by any process without written permission from the AACLAME Secretariat, GPO Box 9880, Canberra, ACT, 2601

ISBN 0 642 15577 1

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A REVIEW OF THE NATIONAL ABORIGINAL LANGUAGES PROGRAM

BRYN ROBERTS
AND
LYNETTE RILEY-MUNDINE

PITMAN ROBERTS AND PARTNERS, 1 MOUNT STREET, PERTH, W.A.

MAY 1990

"Once upon a time people wouldn't admit they were Aboriginal. NOW they stand up and shout they are."
[Mr Andrew Pacey - Gumbayngirr]

"Foreigners are coming to our land and can speak their language. Why can't we speak ours? Because we've been taught to be ashamed of our language, our culture."
[Mrs Shirley Foley - Butchulla]

REVIEW OF NATIONAL ABORIGINAL LANGUAGES PROGRAM

FOREWORD

The National Aboriginal Languages Program (NALP) is one of the programs funded under the National Policy on Languages and on behalf of the Australian Advisory Council on Languages and Multicultural Education (AACLAME) by the Department of Employment, Education and Training. Most of these programs have been reviewed and a report of these is available or will soon be issued.

The Australian Second Languages Learning Program (ASLLP) was reviewed by Mr Moss Dixon and Dr Anne Martin in early 1990. That report has been issued as Occasional Paper No 4.

The Adult Literacy Action Campaign was reviewed by Ernst & Young in late 1989 and is available from the International Literacy Year Secretariat (GPO Box 9880, Canberra ACT 2601).

AACLAME Occasional Papers also include:

a) Occasional Paper No 1.

Submission to the Minister for Employment, Education and Training in response to the Green Paper on Higher Education.

Submission to the Inquiry Into Asian Studies and Languages in Higher Education.

AACLAME Discussion Paper on the possible creation of a National Institute of Languages.

b) Occasional Paper No 2.

Illiteracy in Melanesia: A Preliminary Report - D T Tryon, Research School of Pacific Studies, Australian National University, 1988.

c) Occasional Paper No 3.

Adult Literacy Action Campaign: Projects Around Australia - A review of state and territory level adult literacy projects funded under the Adult Literacy Action Campaign of the National Policy on Languages.

On 28 March, AACLAME held a review seminar to address the two years of work undertaken to date under the National Policy on Languages. The findings of this present evaluation were discussed and incorporated into the AACLAME Report to the Minister. This will become available shortly.

I welcome this very detailed, comprehensive and informative evaluation of NALP, commend the researchers for the thorough way they have addressed their task and assure aboriginal communities and education personnel that these findings have been incorporated into AACLAME's forward planning and recommendations to the Government.

Joseph Lo Bianco

JOSEPH LO BIANCO

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The two principal reviewers would like to thank those people who have given their time to this review. These include the many community people, administrators, linguists, departmental officers, etc. consulted over the period of the review. A full list of places visited and people consulted is provided in the Appendix.

We would also like to thank Susan Guy, Researcher, of Pitman Roberts and Partners for her commitment to the project.

The Review was funded by the National Aboriginal Language Program.

THE CONSULTANTS

LYNETTE RILEY-MUNDINE

Lynette Riley Mundine is Aboriginal Research Fellow and Head of the Aboriginal Resource Unit at the University of New England. She is a qualified teacher and is currently completing a Masters degree in Education. Lynette has a wide range of experience in the Aboriginal and education areas including curriculum planning, resource evaluation, staff training and policy development. She has co-written four books including "Black Australia" and "Colonial Australia" and has presented and published numerous papers, including one on Aboriginal Language Maintenance.

BRYN ROBERTS

Bryn Roberts is a Partner at Pitman Roberts. He is a qualified teacher, has a Master of Arts degree and has recently completed his Doctorate in Education. Bryn has a wide range of experience in the Aboriginal area which includes consultancy work in health, education, prisons, law, tourism, language, fashion, the arts and business. He has written numerous books and is the author of "Aborigines in Business". He grew up in a bilingual bicultural environment and taught in a bilingual school in Far North Queensland.

PREFACE

This review of the National Aboriginal Languages Program (NALP) some two years after its inception has been requested by the Minister for Employment, Education and Training, the Honorable John Dawkins. Its purpose is to establish factors which contribute to the success or failure of Aboriginal language education projects funded through NALP, with a view to incorporating these activities into the planning stages following the implementation of the National Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Education Policy [AEP]. NALP is administered by the Department of Employment, Education and Training [DEET] which is reviewing all its Aboriginal programs as part of the current developments of the AEP.

The review was conducted over an eight week period in September/November 1989. 35 organisations and communities in Western Australia, South Australia, Queensland, New South Wales and the Northern Territory were visited. 176 community members, councillors, language workers, students, teachers, school principals, academics, linguists, administrators, public servants and five NALP Panel members were consulted. A draft report was submitted for comment in December 1989 and the final report completed in January 1990. A review of the final report was undertaken and completed in May 1990.

CONTENTS

PAGE

CHAPTER 1.

INTRODUCTION.....1

. The National Policy on Languages.....1
. The Australian Advisory Council on Languages and Multicultural Education [AACLAME].....1
. The National Aboriginal Languages Program [NALP]....2
. AACLAME and NALP.....3
. The National Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Education Policy [AEP].....6
. The AEP and NALP.....6

CHAPTER 2.

NALP'S ACHIEVEMENTS.....8

. Distribution of Funds.....9
. Number of Languages Assisted.....11
. Number of People Assisted.....11
. Progress of Individual Projects.....11
. Achievements of Individual Projects.....12
. Conclusion.....13

CHAPTER 3.

FACTORS THAT HAVE HINDERED NALP'S SUCCESS.....14

. Policy Factors.....15
. Administrative Factors.....17
. Selection Criteria.....23
. Funding Factors.....25
. Research Factors.....30
. Factors Associated with Linguists.....31
. Factors Associated with Language Workers.....32
. School Factors.....33
. Community Factors.....35
. Resource Factors.....35
. Language Factors.....36
. Planning and Evaluation.....38
. Complementary Projects.....38
. Conclusion.....40

PAGE

CHAPTER 4.

THE INCORPORATION OF NALP INTO THE AEP.....41

CHAPTER 5.

PROPOSALS FOR THE FUTURE.....47

. Aboriginal Language Policy.....48
. Regional Representation.....48
. Aboriginal Regional Language Centres.....49
. Funding.....52
. Community Involvement.....53
. Program and Curriculum Development in Schools.....54
. Training of Aboriginal Language Workers.....54
. Research.....55

APPENDICES

. 1. Projects Funded Under NALP.....57
. 2. Funding Analysis.....77
. 3. Languages That Have Benefited.....81
. 4. Proposals That Were Not Funded.....83
. 5. Places Visited.....94
. 6. People Consulted.....95
. 7. Bibliography.....100

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A review of the National Aboriginal Languages Program [NALP] was undertaken in September/November 1989. It involved consultations with nearly 200 people in 35 Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal organizations and communities in Western Australia, South Australia, New South Wales, Queensland and the Northern Territory. A draft report was submitted for comment in December and the final report submitted in January 1990. Changes were made to the final report in May 1990 on the basis of more detailed comments by NALP members.

The review found that 56 per cent of 1988/89 funding went to Aboriginal communities and regional language centres. Twenty per cent went to State schools, five per cent to independent Aboriginal schools and two per cent to Catholic schools. The remainder went to institutions, private companies and individuals.

The review established factors that contributed to the success and failure of projects funded under the program. However, the assessment of these factors was affected by the lack of clarity surrounding the program's goals.

Ninety-one Aboriginal languages are currently assisted by the program, with over 5000 people benefiting directly or indirectly. The achievements of individual projects were difficult to assess as many had only just received funding or were yet to begin. However they included:

- the development of a range of educational and linguistic materials in a variety of languages.
- a greater recognition by teachers of the linguistic difficulties of children.
- increased levels of pride and confidence in children associated with language learning.
- increased levels of community participation in language projects.
- greater community support for local schools.
- increased student retention rates.
- greater opportunities for cross-cultural learning.
- greater appreciation of Aboriginal language and culture by non-Aboriginal people.

Factors that affected the projects at the community and school level included:

- the inability of partially funded projects to obtain funding from other sources.
- the short term nature of funding resulting in short sighted approaches to language development.
- the lack of synthesis between research, curriculum planning, resource development, education and program delivery.

- the inability of projects to employ linguists in remote areas.
- the need for appropriate training for Aboriginal Language Workers.
- the reluctance of schools to support community language projects.
- the low level of awareness and appreciation of the linguistic backgrounds of children amongst teachers.
- the reluctance of Aboriginal parents to speak to their children in their traditional language.
- the views of some school principals who maintained that Aboriginal language programs would affect Aboriginal children's career options.
- the differences in the quality and quantity of language resources developed.

Factors that affected the projects at the national level included:

- the need for a specific Aboriginal Languages Policy.
- the differences in policy between the States, Territories and Commonwealth.
- the need for language planning.
- the lack of objectives and policy guidelines with which to work.
- the inability of NALP committee members to visit and assess the funded projects because of full-time work commitments and lack of funding.
- staff changes and departmental reorganization of DEET.
- the placement of NALP within DEET which gave it an overly educational orientation.

The Review Team found there was little co-ordination between projects. This was due in part to the tyranny of distance but also because participants did not receive information on the various NALP projects within their geographical area or within their language development area. The co-ordination that did take place was primarily due to the work of Regional Aboriginal Language Centres and, in the case of South Australia, the State's educational authorities.

Factors that have facilitated the achievements and proposals that would aid the advancement of language education projects, require the continued development of Regional Aboriginal Language Centres. These centres are seen as the key to the development of language education projects as they can:

- provide support for Aboriginal language work at the grass roots level.
- provide training for local Aboriginal people to organise, prepare and publish curriculum materials.
- act as resource centres and production centres for each region.
- employ skilled linguists to assist in the development of projects.

- employ skilled curriculum development personnel on a regional basis.
- employ administrators who can assist in submission writing, and negotiations between communities, schools and government departments.
- provide an advocacy service for communities in their quest to establish language programs within their local schools.
- provide a solution to the training needs of Aboriginal language teachers.
- provide solutions to small remote communities which have difficulty accessing information, funding and language planning expertise.
- provide a regional mechanism to link up community and school based projects.

It was felt that most of the difficulties with current school and community language education projects could be alleviated by developing the ten existing Regional Language Centres and establishing four others to form a national network. The appropriateness of establishing new Regional Language Centres would need to be decided by language groups themselves at regional meetings.

It is suggested that representatives from these centres form a national body to develop a National Aboriginal Language Policy.

The Review Team believes that, in relation to language, the planning of the implementation of the Aboriginal Education Policy [AEP] will need to be guided by the following:

1. The development of a National Aboriginal Languages Policy within the next two years.
2. The establishment of expert language education advisory groups within each of the education systems and at each level of education.
3. The need to acknowledge the importance of community initiated and controlled projects.
4. The need to reiterate the principles of the National Policy on Languages as far as they relate to Aboriginal languages.
5. The need for the establishment and development of Regional Aboriginal Language Centres.

In conclusion, NALP has given a large number of groups the opportunity and the encouragement to set in motion a process where the serious neglect of Aboriginal languages can be redressed. This is invaluable and the educational linguistic and cultural potential which exists is enormous. But it is even more than this. Language is the key to a person's culture and culture is the very essence of a person's identity.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

This chapter provides a brief account of the major initiatives in national policy developments which have led to the establishment of the National Aboriginal Languages Program [NALP]. It also provides a background to NALP's parent body, the Australian Advisory Council on Language and Multicultural Education [AACLAME] and its relationship with NALP. It then briefly discusses the National Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Education Policy [AEP].

The National Policy on Languages [NPL]

In late 1984 the Senate Standing Committee on Education and the Arts released its Report on a National Languages Policy. This report recommended the development and co-ordination of a languages policy at the national level.

At the request of the then Minister for Education, Susan Ryan, Joseph Lo Bianco prepared the National Policy on Languages, (NPL) submitting it to the Minister on November 28, 1986.

The NPL contains statements about the status of languages in Australia - declaring English the national language but strongly supporting Aboriginal and ethnic community languages. It has four principles which are: English for all; support for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander languages; a language other than English for all and equitable and widespread language services.

The Prime Minister announced his full endorsement of the NPL in April 1987 and in June of that year Cabinet voted a budget towards its implementation.

The Australian Advisory Council on Languages and Multicultural Education [AACLAME]

In December 1987 the Australian Advisory Council on Languages and Multicultural Education (AACLAME), was announced. The Council is the advisory body which oversees the implementation of the NPL. Funding was provided at the following levels: $15.1 million in 1987/88, $28.6 million in 1988/89, $27.3 million in 1989/90 and $23.0 million in 1990/91.

These funds were used to establish and operate AACLAME and introduce five new language programs in addition to supplementing an existing program. These new programs were the Australian Second Language Learning Program, the Adult Literacy Action Campaign, the Multicultural and Cross Cultural Supplementation Program, the Asian Studies Program and the National Aboriginal Languages Program. The existing program was the New Arrivals element of the English as a Second Language Program.

The initial selection of people to AACLAME is important to understand for those involved in Aboriginal languages. The appointments are made by the Minister for a three year term. Council members are "...appointed in their own right for their knowledge and understanding of language policy and multicultural education issues. They have been chosen for their ability to represent particular language interests, not as delegates or representatives of particular organizations." [Vox, Issue 1; August 1988:9]

Mrs Kathy Trimmer of Western Australia, is one of twelve members of the Council appointed in their own right and has been appointed to represent all Aboriginal language interests. Aboriginal language groups, specifically the Aboriginal Languages Association, has argued that it should be represented on the Council. However, given the plethora of language and ethnic associations within Australia, it is doubtful whether it will be successful. The strength of the Council lies in its smallness and in its firm commitment to appoint people rather than organizations and associations.

Within six months AACLAME began to examine its philosophical and operational principles more closely. The Council believed that it needed a philosophy and a set of operational principles distinct from the goals and principles of the NPL. Some initial draft statements were put forward and the Council agreed to begin preliminary work on a handbook which would restate and reaffirm the four principles of the NFL and state AACLAME's philosophy, operational principles and funding guidelines.

The National Aboriginal Languages Program [NALP]

The National Aboriginal Languages Program [NALP] is a submission-based program. Submissions are examined by a majority Aboriginal selection panel, chaired by Mrs Kathy Trimmer. The selection panel's recommendations are then submitted to AACLAME who in turn makes recommendations to the Minister. DEET's Aboriginal Education Branch also makes recommendations to the Minister in regard to language projects. The program is administered within DEET be the Aboriginal Education Branch. It is designed to provide supplementary funding to State, Territory and

non-government authorities for initiatives in Aboriginal languages including bilingual programs, language maintenance and language awareness programs.

NALP is the smallest of AACLAME's six programs in financial terms. It is a four year program, funded for the amounts of $500,000 in 1987/88, $1 million in 1988/89, $1 million in 1989/90 and $500,000 in 1990/91. Funding was initially provided for a three year period only. However, a further twelve months funding was made available through the National Agenda for a Multicultural Australia launched by the Prime Minister on July 26, 1989.

It is noted that NALP was funded by the Government at half the level requested - $ 2.5 million instead of $5.0 million over three years. AACLAME has made recommendations to the Minister that the level of funding be doubled. However, no further funding is envisaged.

Thirty-nine projects totalling $563,882 were funded under NALP in its first year, the additional $63,882 being provided from AACLAME administration funds. Fifty-three projects totalling $1 million were funded in the second year.

AACLAME and NALP

In the context of AACLAME's role in overseeing the implementation of the NPL and of NALP, it is useful to review AACLAME's advisory mechanisms generally and specifically as they relate to NALP. The difficulties AACLAME has experienced in stabilising its sub-committee structure and determining the roles and relationships of its various committees, has undoubtedly impacted on the progress of NALP.

AACLAME's minutes covering its seven meetings to date, show there have been several changes in the advisory mechanisms used with respect to NALP matters. This has been largely a matter of AACLAME's efforts to gain clarification on the roles of and relationships between its various sub-bodies, as well as the relationship of these sub-bodies to the full Council.

An advisory mechanism for NALP was initially proposed and recommended at the first AACLAME meeting in March 1988. It was argued that because of the specialised nature of Aboriginal language maintenance, an advisory committee for NALP should be established with majority Aboriginal, Torres Strait Islander membership and that it be chaired by the Aboriginal representative on AACLAME. It was agreed that the membership would be two people nominated by the Aboriginal Languages Association [ALA], two people nominated by the National Aboriginal

Education Committee [NAEC] and one person from the relevant area of DEET. Thus, while the AACLAME members were chosen in their own right, the sub-committee members were chosen to represent organizations.

Initially the role of the advisory committee was to develop guidelines for the program; to establish funding criteria and to make recommendations on projects to be funded. It was suggested that it met twice a year and that it provide progress reports on implementation of NALP for each AACLAME meeting. It was also to advise AACLAME of any problems and issues associated with NALP that needed to be addressed. This advisory body was referred to as the NALP Assessment Panel.

In AACLAME's second meeting in June 1988 its sub-committee structure was reviewed. It was also decided that this was an appropriate time to clarify the status and role of the NALP Assessment Panel as the assessment of the first year's applications for funding had recently been completed. It was argued that the NALP Panel had been established specifically to assess applications for funding under NALP and was not necessarily composed in a way best suited to AACLAME's need for standing committees to examine issues and provide it with advice on Aboriginal languages.

At this second meeting alterations were made to the general guidelines regarding the establishment and operation of all AACLAME's sub-committees. It was clarified that committees would be established by the Council at various times to undertake certain tasks as determined by the Council. It was further decided that membership of the sub-committees would consist of one or more Council members and may include persons or representatives of groups invited by the Council to join the sub-committee. The sub-committees would have the Chairperson of AACLAME as an ex-officio member. It was also decided that the sub-committees would report to the full Council and not issue reports or documents as Council documents without the prior support of the full Council. Sub-committees were to be established as either standing committees or as select committees for particular purposes. It was also agreed that smaller Working Groups could be set up by Standing Sub-committees or by the Council to undertake specific tasks or advise on specific issues.

As a result, the NALP Assessment Panel was renamed the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Island Languages Sub-Committee and given two distinct functions. Firstly, to advise the full Council on policy and operational matters relating to NALP and on all other matters relating to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Island languages, and secondly to serve as the panel to assess and recommend on projects for funding under NALP. Membership was to

include the Aboriginal representative on AACLAME as Chairperson, AACLAME's Chairperson [ex officio], representatives of the National Aboriginal Education Committee [NAEC], the Aboriginal Languages Association [ALA], a consensus nominee of NAEC and ALA, and a DEET representative involved in the administration of the program.

Around this time, AACLAME considered it valuable that its Aboriginal representative, Mrs Kathy Trimmer, consult with a broad range of people, communities and projects in order to advise the Council of possible changes to the nature of NALP. The Chairman of AACLAME also undertook to discuss this suggested consultative process with the NAEC, ALA and DEET. It was agreed that the availability of 1988/89 funds should not be advertised until the exercise was completed.

The issue became protracted and in order to avoid administrative problems DEET was advised to proceed with advertising the program and that Mrs Trimmer use other consultative and information gathering options. One of the options suggested was that an appropriate person from each state conduct consultations in their respective states and that the ALA and the NAEC networks be utilised in this process. However, the ALA's involvement could not proceed as its submission for funding, supported by the NALP Committee, was rejected by the Minister.

In November 1988 AACLAME attempted to clarify issues raised in the Council's third meeting concerning the roles of its sub-committees, working groups and assessment panels, and the relationship between these bodies and the full Council. As a result the Council adopted reference groups, sub-committees and assessment panels.

Reference groups were defined as pools from which people could be drawn to provide the Council with specialist advice, while sub-committees were to be formed when some or all members of a reference group were asked to address a particular issue. The tasks of assessment panels were directly related to the operation of programs funded under the NPL.

In accordance with this rationalization the role, tasks and composition of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Island Reference Group were ratified. It was pointed out that as the membership of the Reference Group and the Assessment Panel for NALP were the same, the distinction between the two needed to be clearly understood. The Reference Group as a general advisory body was seen as advising AACLAME on Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander language issues and developing policy proposals for the Council's consideration. The Assessment Panel role was one of assessing proposals on Aboriginal and

Torres Strait Island languages submitted for funding under NALP and where applicable, other National Policy on Languages programs.

The National Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Education Policy [AEP]

In April 1988 an Aboriginal Education Policy Task Force was appointed, under the chairmanship of Mr Paul Hughes, to make recommendations on Aboriginal education policy for inclusion in the 1988/89 budget. The matter was considered urgent in the light of information being collected and disseminated through a number of various reports on the educational inequalities faced by Aboriginal people. The Task Force made specific recommendations about the need to develop a national Aboriginal educational policy to redress these inequalities.

In October 1988, the Minister for Employment, Education and Training announced that a National Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Education Policy would be jointly developed by the States, the Territories and the Commonwealth during 1989.

The main conclusions of the AEP Task Force were supported by those participating in the policy development process and the following objectives were highlighted:

> ". achieving equality of educational opportunity and improving educational outcomes for Aboriginal people; gaining full acceptance of, and respect for Aboriginal culture and identity, including measures to combat racism and to extend the teaching of Aboriginal Studies; maintaining and developing Aboriginal languages and further developing bilingual and bicultural programs; sensitising teachers and educational decision - makers to the need to adopt curriculum and teaching methods to the varying circumstances of Aboriginal students; and in particular; involving Aboriginal people in decisions regarding policies and programs for Aboriginal education." [AEP Draft,1988:4]

The AEP and NALP

DEET's current intention is to intergrate NALP and mainstream its funding under the AEP and has requested the Review Team to establish factors which have contributed to the success or otherwise of the program. In implementing the AEP the Minister has agreed, on advice from his Department, that at least 60% of NALP funds is to be allocated to projects having a direct educational focus supportive of and complementary to the

access, retention, attainment and equity objectives of the AEP. The remaining 40% of projects are to have a research and/or educational focus. This allocation, based on 1988/89 expenditure, has not been accepted by the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Island Reference Group.

We were advised that project themes and specific project proposals, suggested in this report, would possibly be considered in the Department's negotiations with State and Territory education departments, Catholic Education Offices and Aboriginal education institutions in relation to incorporating NALP activities into the AEP. The AEP was officially launched by the Honorable John Dawkins, Minister for Employment, Education and Training on 26 October 1989.

CHAPTER TWO

NALP'S ACHIEVEMENTS

The Review Team was instructed to assess the achievements of NALP objectives by reviewing selected NALP projects. Matters to be examined were to include the number of languages which had benefited from the projects, and an assessment of the growth in the number of Aboriginal people gaining a greater awareness or detailed knowledge of, or greater access to, Aboriginal languages. It was subsequently agreed that the Review Team would visit as many projects as possible rather than concentrate on a small number of selected projects. This approach was justified in that reviewing a small number of selected projects would not necessarily provide a complete picture of NALP's achievements. Moreover, we were briefed that the Department wanted a review in preference to an evaluation. A summary of each project together with its current status, where known, is provided in Appendix One.

It could also be argued at this point that it is a contentious issue to be discussing the Program's achievements when the specific goals and aims of NALP have not been clearly articulated.

It is necessary to be clear that an assessment of the achievements of NALP does not equate to an evaluation of the projects funded under NALP. An evaluation of the projects would involve a considerable degree of sophistication in terms of using a methodology which would address the measurement of aims of the NALP projects such as the development of competency in speaking and understanding a traditional language, the improvement of self-esteem amongst school children, an improved understanding of Aboriginal culture by non-Aboriginal people, the promotion of involvement and understanding between the school and the community and so on.

An evaluation of the projects would also call for expertise in education, linguistics and administration. It would require careful selection of groups and their projects to achieve representative samples of projects and their work etc.

If NALP is to continue and further funding for existing projects is provided, it will be appropriate to conduct an independent evaluation of each project.

An assessment of the achievements of NALP, in our view, concerns an examination of the extent to which projects

are operational and the extent to which the implementation of NALP has led to opportunities for Aboriginal people's language maintenance needs to be addressed. It is not attempting to measure the achievement of the aims of individual projects but to report on what has been accomplished in terms of activities initiated, number of languages covered, people involved, feedback provided and so on.

DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS

Ninety two projects have been assisted by the Program. Thirty nine [42%] of these were funded in the first year of the Program and the remaining fifty three [58%] were funded in the second. The average project value in 1987/88 was $14,459 and $19,307 in 1988/89. The range of project values in 1988/89 was $2,000 to $80,000. The fifty three projects have been categorised as follows:

TABLE ONE

NUMBER OF PROJECTS FUNDED BY GROUP TYPE

State Schools/Education Departments	12
Catholic Schools	4
Independent Aboriginal Schools	3
Aboriginal Language/Education Centres	6
Aboriginal Councils/Corporations/Committees	20
Adult Education Institutions	5
Private Companies	2
Private Individuals	1
TOTAL	53

We have been disappointed that the 1987/88 submissions we requested have not been released to us. A review of NALP's achievements can therefore only involve the fifty three projects funded in 1988/89. Much of the information used here to assess the achievements of NALP is sourced from the 1988/89 successful submissions and our consultations with the projects visited.

Table Two [overleaf] shows the distribution of 1988/89 funds allocated by type of group funded. Appendix Two presents a financial breakdown of funds allocated by group type and items funded.

Table Two shows that the greatest proportion [34%] of NALP funds in 1988/89 went to Aboriginal communities or corporations. State, Catholic and Independent schools received 27% and Aboriginal language/education centres received 22%. Independent Aboriginal schools received 4.7% of funding while Catholic schools received the least amount of money from the program.

TABLE TWO

DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS ACROSS GROUPS

GROUP TYPE	FUNDS $	FUNDS %
Aboriginal Communities, etc	343,403	34.3
Aboriginal Lang Centres	222,790	22.3
State schools	198,802	19.9
Adult Educ Institutions	101,800	10.2
Private Companies/Indiv	63,050	6.3
Independent Schools	46,700	4.7
Catholic Schools	23,455	2.3
TOTAL	1,000,000	100.0

The distribution of the funds by State is shown in Table Three.

TABLE THREE

STATE	NALP FUNDS 1988/89 $	TOTAL %
Western Australia	351,345	35.1
Northern Territory	288,480	28.8
Queensland	178,854	17.9
South Australia	90,648	9.1
New South Wales	70,673	7.1
Victoria	20,000	2.0
TOTAL	1,000,000	100.0

The distribution of projects by State is shown in Table Four.

TABLE FOUR

STATE	PROJECTS APPROVED	PROJECTS REJECTED	TOTAL
Western Australia	16	12	28
Northern Territory	16	12	28
Queensland	13	11	25
South Australia	3	2	5
New South Wales	3	1	4
Victoria	2	1	3
A.C.T.	0	0	0
TOTAL	53	40	93

On the basis of submissions received Western Australia and the Northern Territory had 57 per cent of their submissions approved and Queensland 52 per cent. The southern States did slightly better with the Panel approving 75 per cent of New South Wales's submissions, 67 per cent of Victoria's and 60 per cent of South Australia's. However, the total submissions received from the southern states were small [12 out of 93 or 13%]. On the basis of these figures, accusations levelled against the Panel of a bias towards approving proposals emanating from Western Australia, Northern Territory and Queensland appear unfounded. The Panel is to be commended in its equitable distribution of funds. The Panel did not judge submissions on a State/Territory basis.

NUMBER OF LANGUAGES ASSISTED

The fifty three projects funded in 1988/89 involved some ninety-one languages. A list of these is provided in Appendix Three. It is assumed this number would be larger if 1987/88 data had been made available to us. While the degree to which each of these languages is being developed and the nature of the work entailed for each language cannot be accurately assessed, the fact that such a large number have been brought into focus through the introduction of NALP is applauded.

NUMBER OF PEOPLE ASSISTED

It is only possible to give a conservative estimate of the number of adults and children having involvement in NALP projects [and once again, only for 1988/89, not 1987/88]. The source for this information is the submissions. Applicants were asked to state the number of adults and children involved in their project. However, some applicants failed to provide this information and others simply stated "many" instead of giving an actual figure. A conservative estimate for the number of people involved in the 1988/89 projects is approximately 1,500 adults and 4,100 children giving a total of 5,600 people. It could be argued that all Aboriginal people have been indirectly assisted by the program given the centrality of language in Aboriginal identity.

PROGRESS OF INDIVIDUAL PROJECTS

A serious difficulty in discussing the achievements of NALP in terms of an overview of what various projects have accomplished to date is the time the projects started. Many of the groups funded in 1988/89 indicated in their submission that their project would commence in January and February 1989, yet by September had only just started their project or were yet to begin. Late start

dates or failure to begin was usually due either to the fact that a group had only received its money at the beginning of the 1989/90 financial year or that there were logistical type problems, for example, finding staff or having to revise project goals and activities due to partial funding allocations. Because of these factors the lack of velocity in the progress of so many projects is disappointing.

Our assessment of the progress of each project was not assisted as no project progress reports were forwarded to us from DEET. DEET informed us that, in any case, it did not have many reports to forward. We therefore reviewed the progress of the projects from the small number of groups, funded in 1987/88, which included self-evaluative progress reports in their submissions for 1988/89 funds together with the information we could glean from our visits.

ACHIEVEMENTS OF INDIVIDUAL PROJECTS

We examine in detail the factors that have affected the degree of success of NALP in the next chapter. Given these difficulties, the achievements of different projects have been remarkable. Some of the achievements are as follows:

- The development of a large range of educational and linguistic materials including readers and other aides for teaching.

- A greater recognition by teachers of the difficulties Aboriginal children have in school settings where English is either a second language, a foreign language or a second dialect. The recognition of these difficulties has resulted in a greater understanding of Aboriginal children.

- The introduction of different Aboriginal languages in pre-primary, primary, and secondary schools and at technical and higher education institutions.

- A greater pride and confidence in children who, for the first time, are able to read and write stories in their own language.

- An increase in cultural understanding resulting in better relationships between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal children, for example, the Mossman Gorge project. Communications between the two groups have improved, leading to better relationships between them.

- An increase in children's appreciation and understanding of their parents and grand parents. It

has also increased children's appreciation of the artistic and manual skills of older family members.

- A greater sense of identity, confidence and purpose in children with behavioural and image problems.

- An increase in the number of children who have continued to attend school as a direct result of the Aboriginal language component offered. This has a bearing on Aboriginal retention rates generally.

- Greater community participation and interest in the work of the schools. The presence of Aboriginal people within the school, both as parents and members of staff, has increased as a direct result of the program.

- Greater recognition of Aboriginal languages by governments and non-Aboriginal people.

- More opportunities for cross cultural learning. There is now a greater appreciation of Aboriginal cultures and languages by non-Aboriginal people.

- Greater appreciation of the centrality of Aboriginal identity. This was described by Brother Steve Morelli of Gumbayngirr Language and Culture Group as follows: "Every human being needs an identity, a sense of their roots, their history. People who don't believe in themselves can't operate effectively."

- Increased interest in other cultural activities such as weaving and hunting.

- Increased self-esteem which has resulted in the restoration of the use of skin names, publicly.

CONCLUSION

NALP is just over two years old. Given the short life of the 1988/89 projects and the lack of application forms and progress reports for 1987/88 it is impossible to take stock of NALP's main achievements through an assessment of individual projects. However, NALP has given a large number of groups the opportunity and the encouragement to set in motion a process where the serious neglect of Aboriginal languages is being redressed.

CHAPTER THREE

FACTORS THAT HAVE HINDERED NALP'S SUCCESS

The primary purpose of this review is to establish factors which have contributed to the success, or otherwise, of language education projects funded by the program. These factors are examined in this chapter and discussed in Chapter Four with a view of incorporating NALP activities into the National Aboriginal Education Policy [AEP].

In discussions with certain members of the Australian Advisory Council on Languages and Multicultural Education [AACLAME], the NALP Assessment Panel, and DEET staff, it became clear that some confusion exists over what a "language education project" is. Attempts have been made by DEET staff to distinguish between projects of a primarily educational nature, those with a research focus and those with a mixture of both. Some members of the NALP Panel believed consultation should have taken place with them in regard to these distinctions.

The Review Team found the distinctions made by DEET staff difficult to understand as the rationale and educational philosophy behind them had not been specified. For example, Josie Boyle's work on the development of a thesis on the structure of the Wongatha language, the creation of a dictionary and the writing of every day speech was viewed as primarily educational, while the Anmatyerr Community School Project, designed to encourage Anmatyerr people to read and write their own language was classified as primarily research. The proposals of the various language centres were also spread across each of the three catagories although all centres claim to pursue both educational and research goals.

The specific need for the distinctions is unclear. However, we are aware that the Minister has agreed, on advice from his Department, that sixty percent of future funding under NALP will be directed to projects which support the objectives of the Aboriginal Education Policy. Such projects are to be distinguished as those classified as "clearly educational in focus" [Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Reference Group Minutes of 21 June 1989] The remaining forty percent is to be directed to projects with an education/research mix. Members of the NALP Panel wish to have recorded that they have not agreed to this classification.

Given the lack of clarity we decided not to limit our review to the thirty two projects classified by DEET as

primarily educational. We considered that to establish the factors properly, a more general overview of all fifty two projects was advantageous.

POLICY FACTORS

1. The National Policy on Languages

The overriding positive policy factor in relation to NALP is that it is guided by the National Policy on Languages [NPL]. We consider this to be a document of considerable importance, yet its influence on NALP is minimal. We believe this is because it embraces language in its entirety whereas NALP has a more narrow focus. We are of the view that NALP is not sufficiently guided by the NPL and that the policy should be referred to as "source material" more frequently.

We are of the view that while the goals of the NPL, its aims and objectives are totally sympathetic to and supportive of, Aboriginal languages there is a danger that the NPL is being overlooked by Aboriginal policy makers because the document does not focus exclusively on Aboriginal languages. NALP is a program based on the NPL principle of support for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander languages. Yet its establishment and implementation have seemed isolated and alienated from the NPL in as much as very few guiding principles concerning rationale, operating rules, monitoring, etc. have been applied by the NALP Panel.

While the endorsement of the NPL by the Commonwealth government is of symbolic importance, it is clear that further steps are required in the area of policy development and the fostering of support of policy principles and directives by all relevant public authorities including the Federal Government's own departments.

We therefore believe there is need to consider a separate National Aboriginal Languages Policy as recommended by the Report of the Aboriginal Education Policy Task Force [Hughes,1988:26]. This is discussed further in Chapter Five.

2. Problems of Perception

There would seem to be the perception that NALP embraces all Aboriginal language issues as specified in the NPL whereas in reality it does not. There is also the perception that it is a program when in reality it should be more correctly referred to as a fund. It is our belief that this perception is due, in part, to the nomenclature

used. NALP could be more correctly referred to as a National Aboriginal Language Education and Research Fund, or some such equivalent. NALP currently is a sum of money available for allocation, rather than a program which supports a given allocation, based on and operated through sound principles, aims, objectives and guidelines.

The absence of these stems from the lack of reference to the NPL by DEET, AACLAME and the NALP Assessment Panel.

3. Policy Differences between State and Commonwealth

Differences of policy between the Federal Government and the States and Territories also affect the program. The most glaring example of this is the New South Wales language policy which does not recognise Aboriginal languages as "Priority Languages" [NSW State Language Policy 1988:77] and does not see the need to support Aboriginal language programs. In that State, Aboriginal languages do not fit into mainstream programs because they are not seen as a foreign language. NALP projects therefore exist in isolation from mainstream State funding.

4. Language Planning

We assert that NALP, as a program component of the National Policy on Languages has been divorced from the larger context of goal setting, policy principles, assessment of resource requirements, implementation processes, feedback and evaluation [see Lo Bianco 1989:35]. This review, which we regard as representing the feedback component of language planning, is concerned with the lack of application to NALP of these planning stages. As such we have been hindered through the lack of clear objectives on which such a review as this could be based; the absence of a plan of action involving short, medium and long term planning and the lack of a research and information base on which broad goals can be framed and then expanded on through policy.

5. The need to address other key language policy issues

We are of the view that there is a need to address other key language issues which NALP has not examined at present due primarily to lack of funds. These include the status of Aboriginal languages; the provision of appropriate English language training; support for Aboriginal interpreter services; support for interpreter training; the use of Aboriginal languages in the media and the development of a greater awareness of Aboriginal languages among non-Aboriginal people. We are aware that

in making this assertion that these programs, to some extent, are addressed by schools, adult education centres, interpreter services,etc. We are also aware that due to funding constraints NALP is rightly concerned with language survival and language death rather than language awareness which is supported by normal avenues of school funding.

6. The Inability of NALP to develop policy

During the period of its existence, NALP has seemingly failed to develop policy. We note that attempts have been made to consult with Aboriginal groups in order to formulate policy, yet for a number of reasons, these consultations have not occurred. For example, in the NALP June 1989 meeting it was recommended that if additional funds were made available that the Panel "use a portion of these funds to conduct seminars in the States and the Northern Territory to identify the place of languages within the communities and the role of languages in schools. The ALA could assist with these seminars." [June Minutes]. However, this did not occur as the ALA's application for funding to facilitate these meetings was not approved.

ADMINISTRATIVE FACTORS

NALP as a submission-based program is administered within DEET by Aboriginal Education Branch. Advice and recommendations are provided through AACLAME and its sub-committees - the NALP Assessment Panel and the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Reference Group. The administration of the Program is the responsibility of DEET. AACLAME and its sub-committees are not involved in the running of the Program. The responsibility for advising them of problems with the Program rests with DEET. The lack of a full-time DEET officer to administer the Program is seen by NALP Panel members as having affected its efficacy.

Prior to reviewing the Department's administration of the Program, there is a need to examine the influence of AACLAME and its sub-committees on the administration of the program.

AACLAME AND ITS SUB-COMMITTEES

It would seem to us that the NALP advisory mechanism and AACLAME's sub-committee structure have undergone a series of changes which have impeded the progress of NALP in terms of its administrative development and strength and amount of language work undertaken.

AACLAME as the body overseeing the implementation of the NPL, has had to address difficulties with the structure of its sub-committees, as well as examine its own [as opposed to the NPL's] philosophy and operating principles. While all of this can be viewed as a necessary process given its age and brief, AACLAME has possibly lost some of its authority and direction over the NALP advisory mechanism.

We are of the view that reported disagreement over the structure and function of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Island Languages Sub-Committee [the official new name for the Panel after AACLAME's second meeting] has led to difficulties in carrying out consulting work with Aboriginal communities, and must affect the velocity and content of the work being undertaken through NALP.

We are of the view that AACLAME, as the advisory body for all language groups, could and should play a stronger role in Aboriginal language planning. However, we are also aware of the difficulties in providing this leadership as the Senate Standing Committee on Education and the Arts recommended in its Report on The National Language Policy that "Aboriginal people must be guaranteed the major role in decision-making relating to all Aboriginal language issues." [Recommendation 56]. As currently structured, the responsibility for the development of Aboriginal languages rests with AACLAME, not with its Aboriginal sub-committee. This structure, therefore, does not adhere to the Senate Standing Committee's recommendation.

THE DEPARTMENT OF EMPLOYMENT EDUCATION AND TRAINING

While the responsibility for Aboriginal language policy rests with AACLAME, the responsibility for running NALP as a program rests with DEET. The view held by NALP Panel members is that there is need for greater co-ordination between the DEET national and local offices regarding the program.

1. Advertising of NALP

Currently, the Department advertises that funding is available for Aboriginal language projects in all major national and state newspapers and through Aboriginal networks. Applications are also sent to various relevant interest groups. There are problems with this approach. We believe that other forms of advertising are required in order that the opportunity to access these funds are improved for those Aboriginal people to whom English is a second language, and who have little access to papers and organizations through which NALP is advertised. While we

are aware of the important role language centres, institutions and individual members of NALP are playing in informing local language groups of NALP funding, the program does not currently have a national coverage.

2. The Writing of Applications

Currently DEET has no responsibility to assist the process of submission writing. We argue that this is wayward in the sense that a language program offered to non-English speaking/writing Aboriginal people can have its effectiveness jeopardised at the outset when inherent in the process of submission writing is that the submission must be written and written in English. There is a need to more fully adhere to the NPL recommendations regarding equity and access for those people whose first language is not English. Moreover, we assert that the very Aboriginal people NALP seeks to contact and assist lack experience with bureaucratic procedures and requirements. We are aware that various language centres, institutions and non-Aboriginal people have assisted considerably in the writing of submissions for community groups.

With the availability of audio and video tapes, we believe that applicants could apply in tape form only. This need not be elaborate, as a "talking heads" approach would suffice. We note that in some instances, tapes have been submitted in addition to the official application form.

Many projects stated that they did not know what would constitute an acceptable application form. The critical issue here seems to be one of inadequate and unclear guidelines attached to the application form for NALP funds together with lack of access to the Panel or DEET to clarify such issues.

The Institute for Aboriginal Development in Alice Springs believed that one of the reasons for its successful bid for funding was its ability to write a good submission. It felt that it was unfair that it should be placed more favorably in terms of receiving NALP funds simply because it had the resources to write a good submission. However, this is an incorrect perception, as the writing of a good submission was not shown to guarantee funding success.

3. "Application for Funding" Form

One of the early recommendations of the NALP Panel was for the development of an appropriate application form for funding which was to be written in English. This was completed in 1988 and has now been used for two rounds of funding. People contacted during our visits who were

proficient in English found the form to be clear and concise.

However, many community people found the form difficult as English was not their first language. For example, the Mossman Gorge community asked the Pastor of the local church to complete the form for them and then he only completed it through the assistance of some visitors passing through from Canberra.

We are of the view that for those people with a reasonable command of English, the form is well written and well structured. It needs to be reprinted each year as the current form asks applicants to return their forms by December 1988. The guidelines printed on the front of the form will however need to be expanded and clarified in accordance with point 2 above.

4. Informing successful applicants

Once Ministerial decisions have been made regarding the recommendations of the NALP Assessment Panel, applicants are informed and provided with a formal Offer of Acceptance. In one instance, the Bidyadanga Community were not aware that funding had been approved. We are unsure whether this was due to DEET administrative errors or lack of community accounting procedures. We suggest that this be examined. In another case the Kwombom Aboriginal Corporation reported to us that its Letter of Acceptance of the NALP funds had been lost in the mail and this had, as of September this year, delayed the project's start. Another project had misread the terms of the Offer of Acceptance and was worrying unduly about what was required of the progress report. This could have been dealt with quickly if program administration required each project to be contacted by phone every two months or so.

There is a need for greater clarity regarding the Offer of Acceptance. Although this is signed and returned to DEET, we are of the view that the terms of the offer are not fully understood and moreover, any aspects that are, are quickly forgotten thus making the terms of acceptance meaningless. The Letter of Acceptance is a contractual document which is difficult for people to understand. Jarndu Yawuru Women's Group was confused about the conditions outlined in this contract leading to anxiety about what was required of it. We suggest that this administrative requirement be more clearly written, in plain English and the name of a contact person and phone number provided, should there be problems.

5. Informing unsuccessful applicants

We were advised by DEET that unsuccessful applicants are all sent similar letters stating that they have been unsuccessful. According to the minutes of the Special NALP meeting of June 1989, the Panel recommended that "unsuccessful applicants should be advised diplomatically of the reasons for the rejection of their application. In many cases this would simply be that the other applications were regarded as being of higher priority. Where possible applicants should be advised how the application could be strengthened if they wish the project to be considered in the next round." [Minutes June 1989:4]

The latter part of this recommendation is necessary as unsuccessful applicants had been critical of the lack of advice they had received from DEET in the past. However, the recommendation seems to be suffering teething problems in that unsuccessful applicants, contacted by us, were concerned that they had not been given a clear indication from DEET of why their application had failed. Strelley Community School, a project which was unsuccessful with its application, felt the letter informing them they were of lower priority than other projects was inadequate. They wanted to know specifically why they were not funded. Another unsuccessful applicant said: "this contrasts with the ARC approach - you always find out what's going on so you allow people to do better next time."

A complete list of submissions that were not supported by the NALP Panel, together with a brief description of them and the reasons for rejection, where known, is provided in Appendix Four.

6. Project Support

Once funding is received projects are left on their own. We believe this to be ill-advised especially given the level of NALP funding allocated to Aboriginal community groups. The need for strong support and advice either centrally or regionally is essential. Some of these projects are now receiving this guidance from their respective regional language centres, for example, the Gurungu Council Aboriginal Corporation in Elliot receives assistance from the Papulu Aparr-Karri Language Centre in Tennant Creek. However, there seems to be little support from DEET Central Office. The proper monitoring of the programme by DEET needs urgent attention and may require additional funding and personnel. We found some groups very excited by our visit as it gave them a chance to consolidate project operations, and discuss language issues and to show someone what they had achieved.

We are of the view that communities also require assistance in changing their projects in order to accommodate changing local conditions or align with the receipt of partial funding. Gurungu Council, for example, wanted to orient its project more soundly around the town's three languages than it had indicated within its submission. Again, the assistance came from Papulu Aparr-Karri rather than DEET.

7. Progress Reports/Final Reports

In accordance with the letter of acceptance, projects are legally obliged to submit progress reports during the term of the project and a final report two months after its completion. Our review of this factor has been hindered as DEET has not provided us with these reports. The small amount of information we have, indicates that few of these progress reports are received and that final reports are either not completed or completed at a later date.

We are concerned that the evaluation of individual projects has been left to self-evaluative methods. The only exception to this are non-Aboriginal groups which NALP insists are monitored by the relevant Aboriginal Education Consultative Group [Minutes,June 1989:4]. At this time, we are unaware that the relevant AECGs have in fact been contacted. We also note that the recommendation has not been made to cover specific non-Aboriginal projects.

We note that the NALP Panel has recommended on a number of occasions that bridging funding be provided for projects that have not submitted their final report. We are concerned that the NALP Panel is not provided with current progress reports prior to the allocation of funds. There are examples of funding being deferred due to the lack of these reports. It is our view that the NALP Panel has used its recommending powers judiciously in this regard.

Many of the projects were unclear as to the content of these progress reports. The Jarndu Yawuru Women's Group, for example was unclear as to the requirements placed upon it and had subsequently intended on submitting a report which would have required such a very heavy work load that it would have detracted from the project itself. Others were unaware that progress reports were required.

8. Joint Submissions

In June the NALP Panel made recommendations stating that applicants be advised to collaborate with other groups interested in the same language rather than put in

separate submissions. This advice was seemingly not supported by DEET and as late as September, for example, DEET was advising the South Australian Education Department to put in separate submissions for each project even though the Department wished to make a co-ordinated joint submission. The Torres Strait Island people, the Kuranda School and the Kuranda Community also expressed a preference to forward a co-ordinated submission.

SELECTION CRITERIA

The need for Aboriginal participation and advice has affected the extent to which both AACLAME and DEET have felt free to develop guidelines for the program. In the first year both chose deliberately to leave the setting of guidelines for assessing submissions to the NALP Panel. Consequently the guidelines, were rather ambiguous and not well thought out. The NALP Reference Group acknowledged this factor and the guidelines were considerably strengthened for the second round of funding.

As far as we have been able to ascertain the selection of projects reflect the following considerations:

- The state of the language (healthy, under threat, dying or dead).

- The feasibility or practicality of the proposed activities for language maintenance or language revival. In a number of cases, projects received partial funding because elements of their proposal were not considered to be feasible, or because it was felt that they were too ambitious for the funding period.

- Dictionary projects per se were not regarded as a priority by some members of the Panel, but applications asking for assistance with dictionaries were considered on their merit. [Minutes, June 1989:2]

- The extent to which languages had already received funding from various sources. For example, Warlpiri was a language the Panel considered well researched and well funded compared with a language such as Anmatyerre. Warlpiri was therefore not regarded as a priority.

- The extent of community support and desire for the proposal. This was crucial, and tended to over-ride other factors. It was strongly felt that languages could not be maintained or developed without community support. Again, however, certain projects which had strong community support were overlooked, for example,

the Panel chose Kombumerri Aboriginal Corporation's third and least preferred project option.

- The extent of involvement of Aboriginal community members in the planning, implementation and control of the project. We note that the Panel has recently recommended that priority be given to community controlled programs [Minutes June 1989:2]

- The participation of native speakers of the language was considered important. In one instance the Panel recommended additional funding to that requested by the applicant in order that the native speakers were appropriately compensated.

- The degree by which young community members were provided with opportunities to learn or gain an appreciation of their own language.

- What was being requested. Equipment needed to have direct input into appropriate maintenance, development and revival activities. Moreover, it was only funded when it was not readily available through other sources. Large capital items, such as the purchase of vehicles - often important resources in isolated communities - were not supported.

- The origin of the submission. The Panel was divided in its support of submissions from white linguists, even where there was community support or clear relevance or usefulness to the program. This division was seen by some Panel members, to jeopardise several excellent proposals which were considered to have the capacity to greatly strengthen language maintenance and language development. Submissions from white linguists were occasionally supported such as the La Trobe University submission for work on the Nyulnyul language of Beagle Bay.

- The kind of education projects. The Panel was divided over their support for bilingual education. This made it impossible to fund certain projects in the bilingual area which other members of the Panel regarded as good quality.

- Programs which were seen as the responsibility of State/Territory education authorities [eg funding salaries of teachers for bilingual schools] were not supported. However, salaries for Aboriginal language workers were provided but usually at low rates of pay.

- Some projects were supported without relevant knowledge of local situations. For example, one small community was funded for a full time linguist when there was a full time linguist working on the language

within the community. In this instance the project was requested by the community whereas the linguist worked within the school. Given the limited funds, the Panel may well have altered their recommendation had they known of the local situation.

- Language resource centres [both regional and local], curriculum and materials development, essential research to support educational activities, teaching programs, training of Aboriginal staff to undertake language maintenance and development activities, and the application of languages within the electronic media [where not already funded from other sources] were all considered appropriate activities.

- The submissions received from organizations that Panel members represented and individuals known personally to them. There was some concern expressed by a number of people that Panel members were themselves applying for funds. We were advised that due processes were followed in these instances with the individuals concerned leaving the room while the submission was discussed.

FUNDING FACTORS

1. Fully funded projects

Out of the 53 projects funded 17 were fully funded.

- On one occasion the Panel recommended that a project be given additional funding to that which it requested [Peppimenarti Community Council]. These additional funds were for the payment of Aboriginal Language Workers

- One fully funded project [Thursday Island High School] received over $12,000 more than it had requested. Seemingly the Panel made an error in recommending the project's 1989/90 requirements. This was discovered early and returned by the school.

- Bunbury Aboriginal Progress Association, another fully funded project was funded at the requested level of $31,495. However, they had inadvertently overstated their requirements by $900 through basic errors of addition. We are not aware if DEET or the Panel has been advised of this error.

2. Partially funded projects

A total of 36 projects were partially funded. The number

of partially funded projects is high and impacts on the projects in a number of different ways:

- Once partial funding had been obtained many projects re-allocated this funding in accordance with a general restructuring of the project. While this represented a compromise on what was originally envisaged, the benefit was that local people were making realistic readjustments within their proposal to ensure that the money received was spent as appropriately as possible. For example, at the time of our visit, the Geraldton project was in the process of restructuring. The seemingly logical management of funds received, poses administrative questions especially if the Panel has made specific recommendations to the Minister on the way the money is to be spent. We are of the opinion that this can be overcome by administrative procedures that allow projects to readjust their aims in accordance with the funding received. We believe this issue needs to considered as a matter of urgency by DEET.

- Projects that had been partially funded were forced to find the balance of funds from other sources. However, these funds were often not forthcoming because of the few alternative funding sources available to language projects. Most of the projects the Review Team visited had not been successful in obtaining funds from elsewhere.

- Projects given partial funding were occasionally financially supported by the applicant. For example, the IAD in Alice Springs received money on behalf of the Yuelama Community in Mount Allan, yet its request for travel, administration and equipment expenses were turned down. The IAD has therefore supported NALP projects out of other unspecified funding sources in order that the projects can proceed. We have been advised that an organisation's access to resources is something that the Panel deliberately considers.

- Some projects were of the view that they should request an amount of funding beyond what they needed in the hope that they would receive an appropriate amount. This has implications for the NALP Panel who must ultimately judge the accuracy of cost estimates presented in application forms. This is not an easy task.

- An analysis of project components not funded shows that equipment [12 out of 26 requests] and travel costs [12 out of 29 requests] were the most commonly rejected components. Program running costs [phone, office, stationary, administration, etc] were also not generally supported. Staffing costs were generally accepted with only seven projects being provided with

partial funding for this component. It was difficult to guage the results of the Panel's rejection of these project components as our brief was not to evaluate the projects we visited. However, various projects affected in this way considered that their program had suffered.

3. Seed Funding

We are concerned that NALP is seen by DEET as a source of seed funding only. It is based on the premise that projects, once up and running, can obtain funding for language work from other sources. This is not the case, as has been demonstrated by the large number of projects that have failed to attract funding from other sources. The use of NALP for seed funding purposes need to be re-assessed.

4. Short term funding

NALP provides funds for up to twelve months. We consider short term funding encourages a short sighted approach to Aboriginal language maintenance projects and is to be rejected on the grounds that it contradicts the Prime Minister's endorsement of the NPL.

In addressing funding issues, it would be useful to distinguish between projects on the basis of their probable length. For example language centres which provide essential support and services to surrounding communities, schools and institutions, as well as conducting research, are by nature long term, requiring a commitment to long term funding. For example the Kimberley Language Resource Centre has argued it is not a one-off project. It is an established centre in need of substantial long term funding. On the other hand, the compilation of a dictionary may be a medium term project of two years while the use of elders to tell stories which can be taped and transcribed may fall into a short term category. To make these type of distinctions when projects are initially funded can promote the efficacy of funding, provide a context in which to prioritise funding and support the rationale of funding decisions.

5. Recurrent Funding factors

One of the ways in which the absence of a guarantee of recurrent funding influences a project's future is that other funding bodies are reluctant to fund insecure projects. For example, the Pilbara Aboriginal Language Centre pointed out that the Lotteries Commission in making inquiries to the Centre about its funding sources

wanted to be assured that the Centre had secure funding as a proviso to donating funds for a vehicle.

The absence of recurrent funding or funding on even a medium term basis of three to four years, seriously calls into question the Government's commitment to Aboriginal language education.

We are also concerned that projects have attracted funding despite the lack of progress reports or adequate evaluation. Stricter funding procedures are required.

6. Timing and the release of funding

Complicating the funding issue is the timing for the approval and receipt of funds. It would seem that applications were received in December and yet recommendations were not made until March of the following year. Projects and situations can change in this time. For example, the delay in funds resulted in one project loosing its linguist [Mosman Gorge]. There is also the need to ensure that as a quarter of funds are provided to schools their release corresponds to the academic year.

7. The need for additional funds

One of the major factors affecting the success of the program is the lack of funding. We are aware that funding provided for NALP has not been at the level recommended by AACLAME. AACLAME has pressed for additional funding on a regular basis. For example, in its contribution to the development of a National Agenda for a Multicultural Australia, the sheer volume and urgency of the work to be done in the area of Aboriginal languages was raised. It asserted that:

> "This is probably the area of greatest immediate need in language planning in Australia today. Action is required simultaneously on three fronts:
>
> "Firstly, the provision, extension and adequate support for Aboriginal bilingual and bicultural education programs; secondly, the provision of language awareness programs for non-speakers of Aboriginal languages and thirdly, support for recording, restoration, elaboration and codification, technical linguistic work in Aboriginal languages. The National Aboriginal Languages Program has been funded at one half of the recommended amounts. Given the great complexity of the work required, the large number of languages involved, it will not be possible to make a major contribution to saving Aboriginal languages and to improving education for Aboriginal

children in these languages without a significant expansion of the NALP." [letter to the Director of the Office of Multicultural Affairs May 24 1988:6]

As a result a further $500,000 was promised from the National Agenda. The role of AACLAME in raising funds for Aboriginal languages was not officially acknowledged by the NALP Panel through its recorded minutes.

The paucity of funds has also meant that many worthwhile proposals failed to attract funding. Moreover, certain components have been eliminated from the Program, for example, language awareness for non-Aboriginal people, even though this forms part of the NPL. Given the Panel's need to support more pressing Aboriginal language issues, we support the decisions made in this regard.

8. The administration of funds

In order to conduct appropriate bookkeeping procedures it is suggested that DEET provide clearer advice regarding the acquittal of money. It is interesting to note that some projects have independently drawn up their own acquittal forms, for example, the Jarndu Yawuru Women's Group. However, as a general rule, projects supported by NALP are faced with limited financial training, no access to accountants and require guidance. It is our view that it is more appropriate for this support to be provided regionally through language centres or resource agencies rather than nationally.

RESEARCH FACTORS

While we are sure that there have been some excellent examples of research work undertaken through NALP funding, the evaluation of these projects are not within our brief. A review of research factors that have contributed to the degree of success of NALP highlights the following:

1. Need for greater appreciation of the link between research and education

We are of the opinion that the link between initial research into the language [recording and transcribing] and the development of educational and curriculum materials emerging from this research warrants greater appreciation. Projects based on sound initial research developing into the creation of educational materials for language learning should be encouraged rather than distinguished. One cannot have language education without initial language research as is clearly demonstrated in the Victorian Languages Action Plan which advocates undertaking technical linguistic work as one of the two

forms of language planning. [Lo Bianco 1989:35]. It is stressed that all sound educational projects are grounded in prior research.

2. Lack of a comprehensive data base

Policy development and language planning can only properly proceed when there is an adequate and appropriate data base/information system established. We believe that the lack of such a data base affects the ability of NALP to develop goals and construct policy.

We note that pure as opposed to applied research into languages has been seen by the NALP Panel as the province of the AIAS or other tertiary or higher education institutions. Only 3.8% of the 1988/89 funding went to tertiary research institutions. This demonstrates the NALP Panel's focus on community based projects as opposed to the employment of academic linguists. This is noteworthy as higher education institutions have greater access to research funds than do Aboriginal communities.

A number of research projects which the AACLAME Panel considered to be worthwhile were not supported by NALP. These included two submissions from Professor Dixon at the ANU to develop a comprehensive data base of research, curricula and teaching materials in all Aboriginal languages. We are of the opinion that there is urgent need for such a comprehensive data base, as one of the steps of language planning.

We are unsure whether research proposals rejected by the Panel were eventually supported by the AIAS. We believe more formal advisory mechanisms need to be established between NALP and the AIAS to co-ordinate guidelines for funding and other related language research issues as a matter of urgency.

3. Need to ensure Aboriginal access to research findings

We have been advised that in the past, writing or recording of various languages was done in such a way that the Aboriginal people contributing to the research had difficulty accessing it. NALP funded projects seem more sensitive to these needs than were projects some years ago.

FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH LINGUISTS

In the last fifteen years, considerable expertise in Aboriginal language issues has been built up among a small group of largely European linguists and teacher linguists. An increasing number of Aboriginal people have

studied linguistics or participated in language programs at the School of Australian Linguistics [SAL] at Batchelor, and in teacher education programs. There are also highly qualified Aboriginal linguists available for consultative purposes.

Not withstanding the above, the number of people with appropriate expertise who are willing and able to commit themselves to living in often isolated regions is still small. There are many NALP projects that have not started due to their inability to employ linguists. In certain cases there is a lack of knowledge of where and whom to contact in order to make these vacancies known. The Warrmarn Community's project, for example, had not started due to their inability to attract a linguist. They had contacted the AIAS to inquire about the availability of a linguist, but had not contacted other research institutes or language centres.

There are also instances, such as at Doon Doon School in the Kimberley where the school has been unable to attract a linguist because of lack of accommodation. The employment of linguists in remote areas is not assisted by the working conditions offered. There is no national award rate for linguists and no provision for working in remote locations. There are situations, such as in the Pilbara where the linguist, although paid from DEET funds, is not provided with the same housing, travel and holiday conditions as DEET's Departmental staff. Such working conditions can affect the project's ability to attract linguists. Linguists working in some areas of Australia are accepting poorer working conditions because of the commitment they have to the recording of Aboriginal languages and their interest in the work. The remoteness of some of the projects results in many linguists spending short periods of time in the field and then proceeding to work on the data collected in their offices located outside the language area. This is in sharp contrast to other linguists who continue to develop a relationship with Aboriginal people by working from local offices and living in caravan type accommodation.

We have also found that some of the communities funded by NALP are unclear how linguists should be employed. It is therefore difficult for them to give linguists clear guidelines and job descriptions.

In many instances Aboriginal and Torres Strait Island people requested linguistic training but were unclear how and where to obtain this training. Their preference was for skills-specific short term training.

FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH ABORIGINAL LANGUAGE WORKERS

Aboriginal Language Workers play a vital role in the development of language programs. Yet the level of support and their conditions of pay vary considerably. We have been advised that the NALP Panel has tried to standarise payments.

We are of the view that there is urgent need for a comprehensive program of support and training for Aboriginal Language Workers. There are cases where a school's language program has been unable to proceed from a half hour oral lesson to the writing of language because the Aboriginal Language Worker is unable to read and write his or her own language. These people feel frustrated in their inability to proceed with the teaching of their language. It may be possible for this training to be linked to the Remote Area Teacher Education Program [RATE]. We suggest that this possibility be more closely examined.

There is also a need to expand the availability of the type of courses offered at the School of Australian Linguistics [SAL] for Aboriginal people. We are of the opinion that SAL's role should be expanded and developed regionally. Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people spoke very highly of the school's work. We note that the School is currently undergoing a review of its functions and existence and we hope that this will not mean any diminution in its work with Aboriginal Language Workers. We believe there are too few centres that offer linguistic training to Aboriginal people. We are enthusiastic about the development of a Certificate in Aboriginal Language Work [CALW] at the Pundulmurra College, based on the work initiated by SAL. We will refer again to language worker training in Chapter Five.

We are aware that Aboriginal Language Workers are paid at different rates even though they do the same work. Some are not paid at all. Rates of pay range as follows:

- At Bidyadanga workers were paid in accordance with the Community Development Employment Program [CDEP]. Weekly wages differed due to individual circumstances. A single adult received $120.65.

- At Elliot workers were paid according to "what seems right" which was $300 per week.

- At the Kimberley Language Resource Centre workers were paid according to the Federation of Miscellaneous Workers Union - Hospital Service and Miscellaneous Services Employees Award 1987 which was $310.70 per week.

- At Murray Island workers were paid a rate determined by the teachers involved in the project which was $144 per week.

We are unaware of how these different pay rates affect the Program. Many workers said they would work for nothing given the importance that they accorded to the preservation of their language. Nonetheless, we are of the opinion that the status of Aboriginal languages would be raised if Aboriginal Language Workers were paid appropriately. This may take the form of a national award with a scale depending on the qualifications and literacy level of individual workers. We have been advised that the NALP Panel strongly supports this view.

Currently there is no assistance or guidelines given centrally in determining pay rates. DEET could determine salary levels and pay rates for its projects if it wished. However, there are some projects who wish to determine pay rates themselves in accordance with local conditions. Currently NALP projects have different pay rates for its language workers. None of the projects we consulted received any assistance from DEET or the Assessment Panel in determining these rates.

SCHOOL FACTORS

As has already been indicated a quarter of NALP funding is given directly to schools. However, many of the community initiated and controlled projects are also heavily schools oriented.

We are, on the one hand, encouraged that many States now have languages policies that provide a place for Aboriginal languages within the school curriculum and, on the other hand, disappointed that others have not yet acknowledged this need.

We are concerned that the various policy statements relating to Aboriginal languages may become nothing more than dead words on paper due to the independence of School Principals. For example, Western Australia has a sound languages policy and yet school principals seemingly fail to appreciate the role of Aboriginal language in a child's education in towns where the local language centre could easily assist in this process. The possibility also exists of dedicated principals leaving a school and being replaced by principals who are not as committed to language. There is also the example of Thursday Island where school staff believe the Regional Education Office wants to take control of the project and change it to suit Departmental guidelines.

We are also of the view that many communities have applied for funding from NALP because of difficulties they are experiencing in having their language accepted into their local schools. This presents educational problems as the community is not always able to develop sound education curriculum materials and a sequential and appropriate teaching program.

In many communities visited people felt that it was the schools who took away their languages in the past and now the schools must repay their debts by revitalising the language. They also feel that since children spend so much time in school, it is the most appropriate avenue for language learning.

The high turnover of school staff in many remote Aboriginal communities also present problems of continuity. There are instances when changes of School Principal has meant changes in language direction. School staff are also appointed with little appreciation of the importance of language and a lack of awareness that the children are being asked to learn in either a second language, a foreign language or a second dialect. Teachers in some schools visited seemed unaware that children were in such linguistic situations. There is a need for these staff to attend courses which language centres and others could run effectively.

Staff transfers can also mean that essential information is not passed on. In Doon Doon School, for instance, the Acting Principal was initially unaware of the school's involvement in a NALP project because the previous Principal had not left this information for the incoming Acting Principal. The community has since informed the school and the funds have been put into a high interest bearing account while the problem of employing a linguist is solved.

In many of the schools visited, there were Aboriginal Teachers Aides, Language Workers, Teaching Assistance, etc. employed. Given the expertise available, teachers should be encouraged financially to undertake evening classes with them. In certain instances teachers are already undertaking evening classes without payment.

COMMUNITY FACTORS

We believe that the reluctance of parents to speak to their children in traditional language at home is affecting the success of some NALP funded projects. Children in many northern communities have a passive knowledge of the local traditional language and yet prefer to speak Kriol or Aboriginal English. This is accentuated in communities where three or four traditional languages exist. In many of these places the

working language of the community and of the playground is neither a traditional Aboriginal language nor Standard English. Many members of these communities are increasingly concerned about this trend.

We have also been advised by some linguists that they find that whilst they are involved in the community project, the project proceeds. Once they leave the community however, the community does not continue with it. We are unsure of the reasons for this. We did find that some community projects did not proceed because people were unsure of appropriate methods. Moreover, their self-esteem had been affected through previous government action and contact with non-Aboriginal people. We believe these observations demonstrate the need for appropriate support to be provided to communities during the initial stages of the language project's development.

We have also been advised by parents that they are concerned about Aboriginal language programs in schools as they have been informed by School Principals that the introduction of such programs would affect their children's ability and opportunity to learn Standard English and ultimately affect their ability to find employment. We believe that the development of regional language centres can assist in alleviating some of these parental concerns through booklets and advocacy work.

RESOURCE FACTORS

We have already touched upon issues regarding part funding and the lack of NALP support for equipment funding.

We have also discussed the difficulty experienced by funded projects in obtaining large capital items from other sources. The lack of vehicles can affect projects such as the Pilbara Language Centre which is involved with language projects covering a very large geographical area. We are of the view that NALP's reluctance to fund vehicles needs to be reviewed and suggest special provisions for language centres which provide services to a large number of languages over a large geographical area. We are aware that such provisions will present difficulties for the NALP Panel which is already having to make difficult funding recommendations within an already under financed program.

The NALP Panel and DEET could also play a more active role in giving appropriate advice and assistance to communities in their quest for additional funding from other sources.

The amount and quality of resources developed by many of the projects to date are difficult to assess. Some

projects had been operating for some time and still had little to show in terms of finished product and yet others had impressive resource collections and were continuing to develop materials effectively and efficiently.

LANGUAGE FACTORS

With the apparent mix of strong, weak and threatened languages, there is an inherent conflict of interests between the various language groups as they naturally place a higher priority on their own language before other languages. In this regard a member from a South Australian project said, "Different groups have a lot to learn from each other. The more awareness raising we can do right across the board the better". The wider context of this statement is one which embraces the infrastructure which can be put into place to allow Aboriginal people to support each other in their efforts to maintain their languages.

We are of the view that there is a need to more fully recognise non-traditional languages such as Kriol, Torres Strait Creole, Aboriginal English and Koori English. Some groups such as the NSW AECG felt that the NALP Panel had entrenched views of what were appropriate and suitable languages to fund, with Aboriginal English and southern languages not being considered important. The NALP Panel would, however, disagree with these views. We note with interest the work undertaken by Irruluma Guruluwini Enemburu on Koori English commissioned by the Victorian State Board of Education in conjunction with the Victorian Aboriginal Education Association Incorporated [1989].

We are also aware that many of these languages or dialects are not supported by traditional Aboriginal people who dismiss them as "rubbish language" or "blackfella English". Aboriginal people in Northern Australia wish their children to speak a traditional Aboriginal language and Standard Australian English. However, it is important that the linguistic distinctions that provides Australia with such an immensely rich heritage is acknowledged and recognised rather than used as a weapon in one language group's struggle to obtain funding at the expense of another.

The importance of these languages is recognised in a number of official publications. The NPL points out that "Among some younger Aborigines, Kriol and Torres Strait Creole are asserted as markers of Aboriginality since they no longer use a traditional language." [Lo Bianco 1988:107]

The Report of the Aboriginal Education Policy Task Force also acknowledges these languages. It states that:

> "It is particularly important to recognise the different languages of Aboriginal people, which include indigenous Aboriginal languages, creoles and Aboriginal English. Early childhood education centres, schools and tertiary institutions must acknowledge the role languages play in student learning and adjustment, and adapt their programs to meet these circumstances. It should also be recognised that Aboriginal English is a legitimate dialect, and that many Aboriginal students will benefit from using Aboriginal English in their oral and written work, as well as having the opportunity to learn and use standard English." [Hughes 1988:20]

We have been advised that the use of Creoles [Kriols] particularly in the Torres Strait Islanders is a direct result of interaction with other cultures, the implementation of Government policies and missionary contact. The structures and systems that these people now live under force them to use languages other than their traditional languages. Thus the language is being lost and correspondingly their cultural heritage damaged.

State governments vary in their acknowledgement of Aboriginal languages. Aboriginal languages in New South Wales are not recognised by its Government. Currently, Aboriginal English is taught in some NSW schools through funding provided by the Federal Government's Aboriginal Early Language Development Program. We are of the opinion that given this lack of recognition, reliance for language work in New South Wales will need to remain the province of the Commonwealth Government.

PLANNING AND EVALUATION

We are of the view that groups receiving funds need assistance in setting up their projects. We note that few applications for funding have a sequential plan of action. There is a need to emphasise the requirements of sound planning. Many groups visited were aware of this need but could not act on it given the lack of long term funding and the amount of time and resources devoted to seeking funds.

We note that the NALP Panel in its Minutes of June 1989 has recommended that where non-Aboriginal groups are the recipients of grants that they be monitored by the relevant Aboriginal Educational Consultative Group. We believe that this should either be extended to all projects or that a different monitoring system be established. Monitoring would be more effective if undertaken regionally.

We have not been asked to evaluate any of the projects funded by the program. Currently, the program is self evaluative through the writing of progress reports and final reports. We have been unable to obtain any copies of these reports and cannot therefore make a comment upon them. However, we are of the view that language projects should be independently evaluated, from a linguistic, educational and administrative perspective.

COMPLEMENTARY PROJECTS

The Review Team was asked to examine the extent to which NALP funded projects complemented each other and other Aboriginal education programs.

It is our view that most projects exist independently of each other. This is the major drawback with a submission based program that merely acts on applications received rather than being pro-active in specific areas designated as priorities within an overall framework of language planning. Presently there is little coordination of projects within the same language, the same geographical region or within the same language development area.

This lack of collaboration has not been assisted by projects not being advised of what other projects were doing. Thus a project designed to train Aboriginal language workers in school is not linked to a neighboring project that is developing school curriculum materials and vice versa. Both projects could benefit from each others work even though the language may be different.

We are not aware of any occasion where the NALP Panel recommended or directed that certain projects work together. The Panel did direct some funded projects to work in conjunction with proposals that had been rejected. The Geraldton Regional Community Education Centre, for example was asked to work closely with the Tardun Parents Council. However, Geraldton was unaware that it was required to work with the Tardun Council as it had not been informed of this by DEET. We are strongly of the opinion that all projects be advised of each others' projects.

We are of the view that the only projects that have actively sought to collaborate with, support and complement other NALP projects have been the Aboriginal regional language centres, and the South Australian education authorities. Without the regional language centres many of the NALP projects would be struggling. Projects visited by us requested more information on other projectes funded under the scheme and were keen to co-ordinate their activities.

The extent that NALP funded projects have complemented other Aboriginal education programs is not extensive. Some collaboration has occurred with some Remote Area Teacher Education projects such as Kalkaringi and this could be developed especially as the training of local Aboriginal language workers/teachers is seen as crucial to the success of language education in schools. The colaboration between projects in South Australia was also impressive.

In one instance, the lack of collaboration between projects seemed to have been encouraged by the program demonstrating a need for applicants to detail other language work currently undertaken in their communities. At the Warrmarn community, there is a school language program which is developing materials with the assistance of a full time linguist. This is not funded by NALP. However, the Community has now received funding from NALP to employ its own linguist and to develop its own materials. The Community would argue that while the school program is aimed at school children , their project is aimed at the 12 to 40 age group. We would argue that the development of materials for each group would be similar, and even if this were not the case, would be enhanced through coordinating the staging of the materials and agreeing on a common spelling in the language. Currently this is not occurring with children taught to spell Kija one way in school and another in the community.

CONCLUSION

The factors described represent an array of weaknesses with NALP. Perhaps in the first instance it can be said that these cases as cited help pinpoint specific problematic administrative areas for NALP and that attention needs to be focussed on strategic and operational elements. Weaknesses could be viewed as poor logistics and lack of appreciation of the nature and type of problems which can occur. In specific cases such as complaints concerning guidelines and lack of explanation to unsuccessful applicants, there is a need for the NALP processes to be revised.

However, more generally speaking it is our view, that there have been circumstances prevailing at the administrative level, which have led to those seeking funds under NALP and involved in programs, being left largely to their own devices and not being aware of where to seek help and assistance when needed.

NALP has also been affected by the changes undergone by AACLAME with it sub-committee structure; the composition of NALP with respect to fair regional representation;

factionalism and personality clashes within NALP's Reference Group which has over-ridden the need for clear policy direction and advice; lack of objectives and policy guidelines and principles with which to work; unstable membership of NALP, especially the representation of the NAEC; the inability of NALP committee members to visit and assess the funded projects; staff changes and departmental reorganization of DEET and the placement of NALP within DEET which has given it an educational orientation.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE INCORPORATION OF THE NATIONAL ABORIGINAL LANGUAGE PROGRAM ACTIVITIES INTO THE ABORIGINAL EDUCATION POLICY

A further purpose for this review is to assist in incorporating NALP activities into the Aboriginal Education Policy [AEP].

The Review Team found that this purpose was viewed with concern by all parties associated with the NALP program except for certain DEET staff. The minutes of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Reference Group, for example, documents this concern. The Group was not convinced that the Aboriginal Education Policy would be an adequate vehicle for Aboriginal language maintenance and development. Mainstreaming was specified as unlikely to be successful in achieving these goals. Moreover, the Group believed that languages had not received adequate recognition in the Aboriginal Education Policy or discussions to date. [Minutes, 21 June 1989:2].

We assert that the activities of NALP cannot be incorporated fully into the Aboriginal Education Policy. Language involves more than education, as is apparent in the NPL endorsed by the Government. This does not however mean that some NALP activities cannot be incorporated into the Aboriginal Education Policy. There are clear reasons for this to occur such as the benefits accruing from greater coordination. However, we believe the central place of language in education needs to be restated before this is discussed as we are not convinced that some people understand its pivotal role.

The National Policy on Languages philosophical framework and one of its ten General Principles states:

> "Aboriginal languages have an ancient history on this continent. Aboriginal languages are the product of the unique cultural, historical and environmental identification of the Aboriginal people. Aboriginal languages have been used to define and interpret the Australian landscape and environment and many of these languages remain viable forms of communication. In addition, they are repositories of cultural values, information on socio-cultural organization and law." [Lo Bianco 1987:7]

The Policy later provides the reader with a clear statement of the centrality of Aboriginal language which encompasses much more than education.

> "In societies with oral language traditions the languages provide an irreplaceable repository of experience, history, mythology, spiritual belief, law and socio-cultural organization and values. This derives from the very nature of language itself, the major mediator between experience and thought and culture. The Aboriginal interpretation of Australia- its landscape, environment and the experiences of its inhabitants - is among the most ancient of any in the world. Being unique to this continent these languages are an important and irreplaceable source of self-knowledge for Australia and an inestimable value to Aborigines and their prospect of cultural survival." [Lo Bianco 1987:10]

The foundations of the AEP rests, in large measure, on the recommendations of the Aboriginal Education Policy Task Force. In making its recommendations the Task Force recognised the need for a separate National Aboriginal Languages Policy [Recommendation 14]. We fully support this recommendation. We are of the opinion that the incorporation of NALP-type activities within the AEP will need to be informed by this National Aboriginal Languages Policy.

The AEP would also need to be informed by expert language education advisory groups within each of the education systems and at each level of education. We do not consider that it is sufficient to have Aboriginal people without that language expertise, because such people, while usually "sympathetic", cannot bring pressure to bear effectively to support language learning within education and within bureaucracies which may be hostile or indifferent to their responsibilities with regard to Aboriginal languages.

Having said this we consider that support for language maintenance and language development activities within education programmes accords well with the goals and principles of the AEP.

The first of these educational principles "..aims to improve the availability, responsiveness and effectiveness of educational services as a means of achieving equity of access to and participation in education, and equitable and appropriate educational outcomes for Aboriginal people." [1989:10] This principle is further articulated into three long-term goals involving equity of access to all levels of formal education.

We are of the opinion that this will provide Aboriginal children with equality of access to educational service, in that children who arrive at school speaking a language other than English will, like Anglo-Australian children,

be able to learn their language through the school curriculum. Where bilingual education programs are implemented, the children will, like Anglo-Australians, be able to learn to read the subject matter of their schooling through the medium of their first language.

We are also of the view that the incorporation of Aboriginal languages, as appropriate, within the curriculum will lead to the development of more equitable and appropriate educational outcomes. The incorporation of Aboriginal knowledge through language within the curriculum will give Aboriginal children the same opportunities as Anglo-Australian children to excel in their learning. They will be starting from a position of greater equality, where so far they have been largely disadvantaged. Goal seventeen of the policy explicitly states that it aims "to develop programs to support the maintenance and continued use of Aboriginal languages". [AEP 1989:13]

The second principle states that its common goals "...do not imply any limitation to the diversity of educational philosophies and practices but, rather, encourage flexibility and innovation" [1989:10]. This is an important principle given the diversity of educational approaches supported by NALP, some of which advocate a philosophical approach that differs markedly from that commonly accepted in mainstream Australian schools. This principle should ensure that educational systems, and institutions [which we read as including Aboriginal independent schools] will be able to develop language programs and projects suitable to local circumstances and community wishes. This should include the bicultural "two way" approach of schools such as Yipirinya. Applicants for funding may welcome this principle as we are aware that the NALP Assessment Panel has in the past declined to fund bilingual components of an applicant's submission.

We are concerned that this second principle does not directly specify community initiated and controlled projects, which form the majority of NALP funded projects. We believe that while schools seek language funding largely but not exclusively for the educational benefits derived from various forms of bilingual/ bicultural education, communities seek language funding more for cultural reasons. We were not advised by any Aboriginal person in any of the communities visited that he or she wanted their language taught in school to enable children to learn English more effectively. They wanted the language taught in school as a way of ensuring its survival and correspondingly ensuring that their children had continuing access to traditional law and culture. If it is to be taught in school, Aboriginal people want it under their control. Moreover, many

wanted their language taught out of school in a cultural environment controlled exclusively by them.

Funding will need to be earmarked for these purposes, otherwise there may be the danger that language funding will be used exclusively in formal school settings controlled by large educational bureaucracies, or not used for language at all.

If these informal community language learning settings are seen as outside the AEP guidelines, thus stopping communities from obtaining funding for them, the Commonwealth will need to continue its support [through NALP] until provisions for such initiatives can be incorporated within the recommended National Aboriginal Languages Policy. There is a two year period before the termination of NALP for this languages policy to be clarified prior to the allocation of funding for a programme based upon it.

The AEP's third educational principle is based on the assumption that the progress of students are better facilitated when the efforts of the various education providers are coordinated into a comprehensive and articulated strategic approach across all formal education levels [pre-primary to higher]. This will benefit language as it will all other aspects of student learning.

The fourth principle states that the effectiveness of educational services will be increased through various programs including those to improve the teaching of English as a second language [ESL]. This may need to be clarified during the policy's implementation; for example acknowledging that English for many Aboriginal children is effectively a foreign language [Lo Bianco 1987:85].

The fifth educational principle states that Aboriginal children are more likely to participate in education when certain favorable aspects are present. These include a welcoming educational climate, a relevant and appropriate curriculum, skilled and sensitive teachers and strategies acknowledging different cultural and social backgrounds. Much of this depends on the attitudes of school staff.

As has been demonstrated with the case of Yipirinya School in Alice Springs, incorporation of the first language into the curriculum will improve Aboriginal participation rates in education. However, we are also concerned that policy alone does not change the attitudes of school staff to the importance of learning an Aboriginal language in school. There will need to be firm direction from the central State authority. We are aware of many schools where language, although part of the State's stated education policy, is not supported by school principals and therefore does not occur. Parents

and community representation are also not encouraged to visit or become involved in the school's administration. Too many school principals still view Aboriginal parents as "distant assistants", and the more distant this is, the better. We are of the opinion that the large number of community projects funded under NALP is due in part to the school's poor relationship with its local community. However it is to be noted that a number of projects visited, demonstrated successful school/community relations. In these instances the push for language projects to be undertaken came from the community and not the school. However once introduced, the schools found that everyone involved benefited and have since wanted to continue the projects.

The above statement leads into the sixth educational principle which states that the effectiveness of educational institutions depends, in large part, on the degree of Aboriginal parental and community involvement in its decision making. The policy thus necessitates the involvement of Aboriginal people in educational decision-making, and will provide Aboriginal people with the opportunity to define their needs. This will be of benefit to Aboriginal language acquisition.

While there is an apparent congruity between support for Aboriginal language maintenance and development and the AEP, we are concerned about the ability of the AEP to meet its obligations to Aboriginal peoples' language education needs. The AEP does not seem to recognise adequately the importance of language education in meeting its own expressed goals. Unless there is a clear allocation of funding for languages through the program, some education systems will almost certainly choose to ignore them. We consider that the Commonwealth has a responsibility to ensure that Aboriginal people have access to the same quality of education which is appropriate to the learner's real educational needs as is available to Anglo-Australian people.

We also question the AEP's ability to meet the language maintenance and language development needs of Aboriginal communities, and to be adequately accountable to the Aboriginal communities themselves and the Commonwealth for activities undertaken to meet these needs.

We are also concerned that the AEP will not have the power to provide all the support required for language maintenance and language development. Education systems are unlikely to support regional language resource centres, although these are very important in supporting community efforts.

Another potential difficulty is that language boundaries in Australia do not reflect State/Territory boundaries nor boundaries between education systems. Passing

responsibility for Aboriginal languages to State oriented education systems will inevitably lead to inconsistencies of approach both within individual languages and across languages.

At the very least the principles of the NPL as far as they relate to Aboriginal languages need to be reiterated. It should be reaffirmed that these principles have been endorsed by the Prime Minister and therefore represent an existing Government commitment to Aboriginal languages.

CHAPTER FIVE

PROPOSALS FOR THE FUTURE

The Review Team was asked to identify project themes and specific project proposals for possible consideration in DEET's discussions with State and Territory Education departments, Catholic Education Offices and Aboriginal education institutions.

Given the factors discussed in Chapter Three we believe these negotiations will be enhanced through the development of a cohesive approach to language planning. For this to occur, there is a need for DEET, AACLAME and NALP to clearly identify their goals, policies, priorities, strategies, actions and outcomes for Aboriginal language development. To identify project themes without an existing language planning structure would invite criticism that the review team had become a party to the continuation of the ad hoc nature of NALP.

In Victoria's Languages Action Plan, the universal identifiable stages of language planning have been outlined. They are:

1. The formulation of goals;
2. The evolution of a policy (articulating the goals into principles);
3. The assessment of resource requirements to meet the goals;
4. The calculation of a staged implementation process;
5. The implementation is enacted;
6. The obtaining of feedback;
7. The evaluation of the process.
   [Lo Bianco 1989:35]

The Action Plan is worth quoting in full at this point:

> "The process of establishing goals can occur by either deducing from broad principles those goals which logically flow and can be described or, by inducing from several instances of any occurrence the general patterns which can be fed into a policy. This stage is primarily concerned with conceptualization. The degree to which it can be transformed eventually into a detailed plan is strongly influenced by the quality of the data-base which is available. The subsequent stages of implementation are primarily about management, i.e. fitting resources to goals and supervising the actual practice. The later stages are primarily concerned with reflecting on the process with a view to modifying it for improvement." [Lo Bianco 1989:35]

With an appreciation of the necessary stages of language planning, one can start understanding the difficulties the review team has had in being asked to provide feedback [Stage 6] before the first five stages have been clearly articulated. DEET's request for project themes is understandable in this context as the goals and policies relating to Aboriginal language planning is the province of AACLAME and its sub-committees and should by now have been clearly enunciated. Moreover, the AEP is now in place and an assessment of resource requirements to meet the goals of the policy has been made. However, Aboriginal language planning is embryonic and DEET's perspective premature. Suggestions for project themes in this kind of planning environment are meaningless.

We can however suggest themes which would form the basis for discussion within Aboriginal language circles. Once these themes are discussed, goals can be established and policy formulated. We again stress that what is suggested here are themes only. They are designed to trigger discussion. They are not recommendations.

ABORIGINAL LANGUAGE POLICY

We believe it would assist the Department in its dealing with the various educational departments, organizations and institutions if the basis for these discussions occurred within the context of a National Aboriginal Language Policy setting. Language and education are different. While we acknowledge that language is an important part of education which has rightfully been recognised as such within the AEP, correspondingly, education is an important part of language which needs to be placed within the context of an National Aboriginal Language Policy.

We believe language policy should be developed by people in the Aboriginal language area and that these people should represent all administrative regions suggested by the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission. We are aware that Aboriginal language policy will encompass areas that are not the province of DEET [for example, interpreter services]. However, DEET will need to be involved in developing the education side of the policy in order to ensure that it dovetails with the AEP. The placement of NALP within a DEET context has probably given the Program an unnecessarily heavy education emphasis and a perception that NALP was established purely for language education. However, AACLAME's brief clearly demonstrates that the role of its sub-committees is far wider than this.

REGIONAL REPRESENTATION

We are of the view that the current composition of the NALP Assessment Panel and Aboriginal and Torres Strait

Islander Reference Group does not adequately represent the language interests of all Aboriginal people. The sub-committees themselves acknowledge this fact and have in recent times attempted to increase their membership. However certain groups visited by us believe that a different sub-committee composition is necessary. For example, Western Australia and the Northern Territory account for 64% of the funds and yet has only two representatives.

We are of the view that regional representation is required. This may dovetail in with the administrative boundaries developed through the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission [ATSIC] or could involve representatives from the following regions:

. South West
. Pilbara
. Kimberley
. Top End [West]
. Top End [East]
. Tablelands
. Central Australia
. South Australia
. Torres Strait Islands
. Northern Queensland
. Southern Queensland
. New South Wales
. Victoria/Tasmania
. Western Desert Area

The need for equal representation from each State is not supported as the State boundaries are seen as lines on a map drawn up long after Aboriginal nations, complete with their own language, laws and culture, had clearly defined their own borders. To talk of State representation within the Aboriginal linguistic area fails to acknowledge these Aboriginal nations and recognises the more recent administrative divisions drawn up by non-Aboriginal people.

We believe the issue of regional representation requires careful discussion and deliberation by people directly involved in the Aboriginal languages area.

We suggest that one representative from each region be placed on a national panel, under the direction of AACLAME, and that their first task be the development of a National Aboriginal Languages Policy.

ABORIGINAL REGIONAL LANGUAGE CENTRES

The concept of developing Aboriginal language centres to cover the nation is not new. For example, Jane Simpson [1987] and Patrick McConvell [1987], [1988] have written papers in support of regional language centres. We do not

intend to fully elaborate on these ideas here but refer the reader to the two documents cited in full in Appendix Seven. The arguments for their establishment are strong. Regional language centres:

- Provide support for Aboriginal language work at the grass roots level.
- Provide support for local people who wish to be involved in school and community language and culture programs.
- Provide training for local people to organise, prepare and publish curriculum materials.
- Act as a resource centre, store house and production centre for the region.
- Allow access to skilled linguists to assist in orthographies, etc.
- Allow access to skilled curriculum development personnel on a regional basis.
- Provide access to administrators who could assist in submission writing, negotiations with schools, government departments, etc.
- Provide an advocacy service for communities in their quest to establish language programs within their schools.
- Provide a solution to the training needs of Aboriginal language teachers through an extension of the External or Remote Area Teacher Education program.
- Provide solutions to small remote communities who have difficulty:
    - Accessing reliable information
    - Accessing funding
    - Accessing language planning expertise
    - Implementing strategies
    - Developing assessment and evaluation procedures
    - Co-ordinating resources
- Provide a mechanism to link up individual projects.

The resources available for Aboriginal languages need to be used more wisely. Currently, they are "muddling along with an unco-ordinated set of programs, some of which are inadequate because of chronic lack of support, cannot solve the problems effectively.." [McConvell 1987:1]

We suggested DEET examines the establishment, development and support of the following Aboriginal Regional Language Centres.

. South West	Perth WACAE
. Pilbara	Hedland
. Kimberley	Halls Creek
. Top End [West]	Bachelor SAL
. Top End [East]	Yirrkala
. Tablelands	Papulu Apparr-Kari
. Central Australia	Alice Springs IAD
. South Australia	To be determined
. Victoria/Tasmania	Monash University
. Northern Queensland	Cairns
. Torres Strait Islands	Thursday Island
. Southern Queensland	To be determined
. New South Wales	To be determined
. Western Desert Area	To be determined

Ten of these regional language centres are already established, the remainder could be funded over the next four years on a priority plan basis. It is again stressed that while we are strongly in favour of regional language centres we believe the precise location and establishment of these centres requires careful consultation with the regions and the States.

The support of these centres fits easily into the six principles of the AEP in that the concept:

- Recognises, supports and encourages the equity and access provisions of the first principle of the AEP

- Allows for a diversity of educational philosophies and practices and encourages flexibility and innovation as stated in the second principle of the AEP.

- Encourages community initiated and controlled projects, as indicated within the second principle of the AEP.

- Allows for a regional language education focus which will assist educational providers to co-ordinate a comprehensive and articulated strategic approach across all formal education levels as emphasised in the third AEP principle.

- Encourages curriculum planning. These centres could be staffed by a teacher with curriculum development experience.

- Contributes to the professional development of teachers. The fifth principle stresses the importance of the attitudes of school staff. Regional language centres can be used to provide staff training in

language appreciation and development. They would form the professional link between the languages of the region and the neophyte teacher who has never worked with Aboriginal people and is not aware of their rich linguistic and cultural heritage.

- Encourages community involvement. The sixth principle states that the effectiveness of educational services depends in large part on the degree of Aboriginal parental and community involvement. The regional language centres align parental and community involvement in language development more closely to the AEP than does a national body sitting in Canberra.

- Acknowledges language distribution. The development of regional language centres acknowledges that language areas are not limited by State borders. The need for different administrative structures for Aboriginal people has been acknowledged by the ATSIC regional areas.

- Enhances the AEP's ability to meet its obligations to Aboriginal people's language education needs.

- Assists in the training of Aboriginal Language Workers. Language centres could form the nucleus for regional training for Aboriginal language workers. This would enhance a structure currently available where Aboriginal language workers are taught both on a State basis [through Batchelor and probably Pundulmurra College in 1990] and on a local basis through the "on site" provisions of these courses. Such regional provisions would also encourage a co-ordinated approach to the training of language workers and the teaching of language in schools. Regional language centres could also train Aboriginal media workers, literacy workers, interpreters, etc.

- Encourages language planning.

FUNDING

We suggest that the responsibility for the selection of projects currently undertaken through the NALP Assessment Panel in Canberra be discontinued. Regional language centres are more conversant with regional language needs and funding should be provided for distribution by them. Regional Assessment Panels could be convened and regional decisions taken on regional language issues.

Selection of projects could be guided by nationally approved guidelines which emerge out of the National Aboriginal Languages Policy. Different regions could also have their own regional language policies which again would be guided by the National Aboriginal Languages

Policy. Regional language centres would need to demonstrate language planning processes and ensure that their priorities and strategies blend into national priorities and strategies before funding is provided. Funding would be allocated on the basis of criteria which would be established by representatives of the regional language centres. Sixty percent of the funded projects could be allocated to schools/education as recently directed with forty percent provided for research activities.

As mentioned by Jane Simpson "language centres provide a cheap infrastructure for assisting several communities to develop and run language maintenance programmes". This is an important point especially as at least $623,000 [62.3%] of NALP funding went to the payment of language staff with the possibility of the majority of another $226,000 [22,6%] of unspecified or unknown funding having been used for these purposes.

Language Centres would need to be funded triennially. There would need to be an understanding from the outset that these centres are long term solutions to language issues.

Given that language centres meet all six principles within the AEP, it is within DEET's capacity to fund them.

COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

We are aware of the National Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Education Council's Draft Guidelines 11 regarding the teaching of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Languages in Schools. Its first principle states that "Aboriginal and Torres Strait Island people should be involved in all decision-making regarding the teaching of their languages" [NATSIEC:1989:3] It further states that such languages should only be taught in schools when the community supports the program, the community chooses the language(s) to be offered and the community is involved in the choice of the language teacher(s). The Hughes Report also supports this principle:

> "Community involvement must be based on the principle of Aboriginal self-determination in education, a principle which has been supported by successive Commonwealth Governments over the last fifteen years. Aboriginal people must be able to influence the nature of the education available to their children, and the curricula studied by them. This, in turn will mean that education becomes responsive to the diversity of circumstances and life-styles among Aboriginal communities, that education is responsive to Aboriginal culture and needs, and that it recognises

and values the cultural backgrounds of students." [Hughes: 1988:18]

We also add our support of the principle of community involvement.

PROGRAM AND CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT IN SCHOOLS

We support the Draft Guidelines prepared by the National Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Education Council. we suggest that the DEET discuss these issues with the Council.

TRAINING OF ABORIGINAL LANGUAGE WORKERS

In talking to people directly involved in language work, it became clear to us that the skill levels of Aboriginal language workers are central to language development. There are a significant number of these workers involved in NALP projects. The great majority of these people are community elders and parents. Their desire and enthusiasm in supporting language work is undeniable with many of them having been involved with other language work besides that funded by NALP. One elderly lady from the Warrmarn Community said she had been going to the local school every morning for years and at the Bidyadanga Community there are over twenty women who have maintained their involvement with the primary and high school for several years.

What is apparent is that many Aboriginal language workers have had no formal language or teacher training and rely on their accumulated experience in working with school children, their natural ability to teach and their knowledge of their native tongue to cope in the classroom situation. Yet training is required. As Patrick McConvell states "...once Aboriginal teachers skilled and trained in handling curriculum in their own language appear on the scene, many of the current problems will be solved." [McConvell 1987:4]

While these people are to be given full credit for their dedication to language work, they are at a distinct disadvantage in not having the training which a teacher in a school setting, instructing in any other language, is not only expected to have but is compelled to have.

Having been made aware of these difficulties, we have confidence in supporting the proposal from Pundulmurra College in South Hedland, Western Australia, for a course which is to be offered through its Department of Aboriginal Linguistics, for a Certificate in Aboriginal Language Work. The course is an exciting innovation and we urge the Department to look closely at it. The course

is run in short modules which can be undertaken at the college or in the Language Workers' own communities.

In presenting the rationale for the implementation of the course the proposal stated that Aboriginal languages cannot be taught without speakers of those languages being trained in language teaching techniques. The Pundulmurra proposal is strongly supported by a number of Aboriginal communities and linguists including Wilf Douglas, who has undertaken extensive language work in the Western Desert. Douglas asserts that:

> "Many Aboriginal people today are beginning to take pride in their own languages and cultural traditions and desire to record their unwritten literature before it is lost forever. To engage in such recording implies the ability to be able to write, to be able to decide on what form of alphabet to use and a host of other skills normally required in writing, reproducing, publishing and distributing literature." [Pundulmurra College:1989:5]

The National Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Education Council in its second draft guidelines for teaching Australian and Torres Strait Island languages in schools, upholds a principle of professionalism of Australian and Torres Strait Island language programs and this involves the development of competent language teachers to teach languages at all school levels. The issue of training Aboriginal language workers involves a commitment to language work at a professional level and in a consistent manner. We suggest that AACLAME provides an opportunity for its Aboriginal and Torres Strait Island Reference Group to examine this issue and formulate a proposal for future work addressing the training of Aboriginal language workers.

RESEARCH

As has been discussed in Chapter Three there is a need to develop an appropriate research/information data base on which to develop goals, policies, etc. The National Policy on Languages advocated the establishment of a key national centre for Aboriginal languages. The development of such a centre should be supported.

We also believe that there is a need to document Aboriginal languages as a matter of national importance. The recording of Aboriginal languages is part of our nation's heritage and should be of concern to the wider Australian community. This is not the case and demonstrates the monolingual, anti-intellectual, narrow, historical perspective of most Australians. We note with interest the proposal submitted by Professor Bob Dixon to establish a Research Centre for Australian Aboriginal

Languages in Canberra, together with the current situation which the School of Australian Linguistics at Batchelor faces. We are also aware that there are exceptionally talented and dedicated linguists available from other institutions. The documentation of Aboriginal languages needs a commitment from Government and the ability of AACLAME to make difficult recommendations. Whatever, institution is accorded the work, the others will need to work closely with them for the good of Aboriginal languages generally.

There is also the need to link Aboriginal language research more closely with the AIAS and the recently established Language Institute of Australia.

APPENDIX ONE

PROJECTS FUNDED

A total of 53 proposals were recommended for funding by the NALP Assessment Panel. They involved the following:

State Schools/Education Departments.....13
Catholic Schools..... 4
Independent Aboriginal Schools..... 3
Aboriginal Language/Education Centres..... 6
Aboriginal Councils/Corporations/Committees.....19
Adult Education Institutions..... 5
Private Companies..... 2
Private Individuals..... 1
TOTAL.....53

All projects marked * were visited during the course of the review.

STATE SCHOOLS/EDUCATION DEPARTMENTS

1. AURUKUN STATE SCHOOL, AURUKUN, QUEENSLAND.

The proposal, submitted by the School Principal, was to develop and maintain the Wik Mungkan language through a bilingual program. It proposed to produce a fortnightly bilingual newspaper and to publish children's writing in Wit Mungkan. However, the requested funding of $30,164 was not supported as the Panel considered that the school paper should be supported through other sources such as the Queensland Department of Education. The panel also expressed concern regarding the bilingual approach to language teaching. However, the project was eventually part funded for $13,537.

2. COCONUT ISLAND STATE SCHOOL, COCONUT ISLAND, T.S.I.

The proposal, known as the Kala Gawa Ya Traditional Language Revival Project, was to develop awareness and appreciation of the children's own traditional language and to promote initial competence in oral and written forms of the language. It was asserted that this would in turn enhance children's sense of identity and the general community's value of the language. The project was to be undertaken as daily integrated lessons within the school's Cultural Studies program. The aim was to use Kalaw Gawa Ya speakers within the school and focus on meaningful conversational language relevant to daily life

and activity. Teaching materials would also be produced. The language is the most widespread of the T.S.I. traditional languages where Torres Straits Creole is the first language and Standard English the second language. Although the requested funding for 1988,89 was $7,350, the Panel seemed to have been confused by the application and instead allocated $19,100 to it [a sum requested by the applicant for the following year, 1989/90]. The matter was further complicated by the 1989/90 funding being miscalculated by the applicant itself. The funding requested for 1989/90 was in reality $22,100 [errors having been made in adding up the various categories]. Moreover, the Panel gave no reasons for its support of the project in its minutes. In the breakdown of NALP project costing, the discrepancy of $3,000 has been balanced by a decrease in the projected staffing levels [from $18,000 to $15,000]

3. * DOON DOON PRIMARY SCHOOL, KIMBERLEY, W.A.

The project, known as the Dawul Language and Culture Project, is to provide the opportunity for children to learn their traditional language in spoken and written form. It will involve the community in the children's education and aims at preserving the Woolah language. The application stressed that this was an Aboriginal community project in that the community had approached the school and requested that language be taught. Only two members of the community speak Woolah. Funding was requested to employ a linguist to document the language and produce literature. Community members would be paid to assist the linguist. The requested funding of $12,000 was supported by the Panel with the proviso that the linguist employed be appropriately qualified and that the project remains under the control of the community. The project has not yet begun as the community has been unable to employ a linguist. The money is held in a separate interest bearing account opened by the acting School Principal.

4. * KAURNA PLAINS SCHOOL, ADELAIDE, S.A.

The project, known as the Narrungga and Narrindjeri Curriculum Development and Implementation Project, is to provide language courses relevant to the students, parents and community of Kaurna Plains School. It seeks to give Aboriginal children a better understanding of culture through language acquisition and plans to develop curriculum materials to ensure these aims are met. A linguist is to be employed who will also develop curriculum materials. The requested funding of $36,000 was supported by the Panel on the basis that Kaurna Plains was "..an Aboriginal school employing only Aboriginal teachers.." The Panel suggested that a teacher linguist be more appropriate for the project due to the focus on curriculum development. It also stressed the

need for the teacher linguist to be appropriately qualified and that the project remains within Aboriginal control. The review found that the large majority of teachers at Kaurna Plains were Aboriginal.

This group supported another group in the Adelaide area which wanted to put in a single submission for all languages because four or five submissions from that area were all proposing similar work. The group expressed an interest in putting in a State co-ordinated project, to Canberra, however DEET advised it to put in separate proposals to be based on their own merits.

5. * MOSSMAN STATE HIGH SCHOOL, MOSSMAN, QUEENSLAND.

The proposal, known as the Kuku Yalanji Language and culture Preservation Project, was developed jointly with the Mossman Gorge Aboriginal Community. The project plans to foster a greater understanding and knowledge of the local Aboriginal language and culture within the wider local community and to cultivate in the young a pride and desire to preserve their language and culture. It also aims at encouraging adults to speak their mother tongue more often. Literacy classes will be held and videos produced involving autobiographies, dreamtime stories bush medicine and bush tucker. The project will be closely involved with the ten week Kuku Yalanji Culture and Language Appreciation Course run at the High School. However, the requested funding of $4,000 was only partially supported by the Panel. It believed that equipment [$570] and printing [$300] costs should be born by the school. However, it agreed to fund staffing [$2,130] and half the travel costs [$500] totalling $2,630.

6. * MURRAY ISLAND STATE SCHOOL, MURRAY ISLAND, T.S.I.

The project, known as the Murray Island Language Development Program, is to maintain and develop the Miriam Mir language. There are currently 100 speakers of the Miriam Mir language in the community and a total of 800 speakers. The project aims to strengthen self identity and enable Murray Islanders to trace their origins in order to have a clearer picture of the future. The program has approached these objectives through "insertion classes" at the school [three language teachers teaching four and a half hours per week for forty weeks] which include field trips, interviews, booklet making, etc. While evening adult classes for two hours each week for forty weeks were discussed in the proposal, these are not currently being conducted. The program has been going since 1986. The requested funding of $22,800 was not totally supported by the Panel. However, it agreed to fund the salaries of the language teachers [$15,000]. Equipment [$7,000] and travel [$800] costs were not supported on the basis that they should be

provided by the school or within local resources. This is difficult on an island the size of Murray Island.

7. * SOUTH AUSTRALIAN EDUCATION DEPARTMENT, ADELAIDE, S.A.

The project, known as the Ngarrindjerri/Narrunga Project, aims to maintain these two languages in nominated Adelaide Area schools. It plans to do this by training speakers of the language as teachers and gathering together existing resources and develop new ones. It also plans to teach the languages to Nunga children who nominate to be part of the program. The application suggested three options for the Panel's consideration which involved various staffing possibilities. The cheaper of these options [which was also seen as the most realistic] was supported by the Panel to the full amount of $29,648.

8. SOUTH AUSTRALIA EDUCATION DEPARTMENT, PORT AUGUSTA, S.A.

The project, known as the Common Language Dictionary of Yura Ngawarla, aimed to contribute to the maintenance of Yura Ngawarla through the development of a dictionary. The proposal was prepared by Western Area Aboriginal Education on behalf of the Adnyamathanha Community, Nepabunna School and the Port Augusta District. However, the requested funding of $55,200 received only partial support from the Panel. It considered that the twelve month project could be completed in six months. It agreed to provide funding for salaries for six months [$23,500], the production and printing of resources [$1,200] and half of the requested travel [$1,500] and accommodation costs [$1,500]. It would not support the funding of computer equipment [$6,000].

9. STEPHEN ISLAND STATE SCHOOL, STEPHEN ISLAND, T.S.I.

The project, known as the Meriam Mer Traditional Language Revival Project, has identical aims to the Coconut Island State School. The project is undertaken as part of the school's Cultural Studies Program. Language materials are to be developed with one of the school staff being a fluent Meriam Mer speaker. The language is dying out at Stephen Island where Torres Strait Creole is the first language and Standard English the second. The requested funding of $7,150 was supported by the Panel on the basis that the few surviving speakers of the language [three in the community and several hundred elsewhere] gave the project a high priority. It stressed that all staff appointed were to be appropriately qualified and that the project was to have Aboriginal control or involvement. A final report was to be provided at the end of 1989 with a final report due two months after completion. It further

recommended that the school be advised to apply for their 1989/90 funds [$18,900] in the next round.

10. * THURSDAY ISLAND HIGH SCHOOL, THURSDAY ISLAND, T.S.I.

The project, known as the Western Language Teaching Program is to preserve the Kalaw Lagaw Ya language of the Torres Strait [currently estimated to involve 3000 speakers]. The aim is to have students speak and write the language providing the opportunity for increased cultural awareness and language appreciation. This will be achieved through two forty minute lessons per week for forty weeks at the Year 8 level. Students will be formally tested in both an oral and written format. Year 11 students will also be involved. The requested funding of $7,337 was supported by the Panel with the proviso that the stationary be clearly marked to indicate that it was for the language program. The school inadvertently received $20,000 which they returned to DEET.

11. * THURSDAY ISLAND PRIMARY SCHOOL, THURSDAY ISLAND, T.S.I.

The project, known as the Promotion of Torres Strait "Western Language" in Years 6 and 7 Project, is to help ensure the preservation of Western Language in the Torres Strait. It aims to include Torres Strait Studies across the curriculum [English, Social Studies, Art, Science, Music, Dance and Mathematics] and will teach Western Language in its own right and apply it where appropriate. Parents will be involved as much as possible with classroom teachers offering strong support. An English Western Language Dictionary will also be produced. The requested funding of $25,910 was not fully supported by the Panel as it felt that the school did not require NALP funding for equipment [typewriter, computer, photocopier toner, cassette players, etc] transport, stationary and printing costs. The Panel agreed to provide funding of $17,000 for the salaries of a linguist and clerical assistant.

12. * VICTORIA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

The project, known as Documenting Aboriginal Languages in Victoria, was a joint submission with the Victorian Aboriginal Education Association Incorporated [VAEAI] with the contact person being employed by the State Board of Education. The project had four broad aims which the Panel dealt with independently. The Panel considered the first aim, which was to investigate the relationship between Aboriginal languages and Aboriginal English as unnecessary as it was already well documented. The second aim which was to identify Aboriginal languages or parts of languages in Victoria as a cultural statement was seen by the Panel as useful and desirable. The third aim which

was to trial ways of documenting Aboriginal languages was also considered unnecessary. The fourth aim which was to identify the implications of the findings about Aboriginal languages for the teaching/learning of Aboriginal students was not mentioned in the Panel's minutes. On the basis of the above the Panel rejected the requested funding of $48,000 for the project and agreed to provide $10,000 in order to fund a salary for six months and to allow VAEAI to coordinate the data collection. The Board did not give an indication of what position this salary was to be used for. Requests for travel, accommodation, stationery, administrative and telephone costs were not supported.

13. WALUNGURU SCHOOL, KINTORE, N.T.

Two projects were suggested by the school. The Wiltja Cultural Maintenance Project involved the construction of a large wiltja outside the school in order that the old people could congregate and tell stories and make artifacts. However, the Panel rejected this funding request as it saw the project as being outside the NALP guidelines. The second project, known as the Outreach Cultural Maintenance Project involved older members of the community travelling to their own country thus creating natural language learning situations. Forty two locations were identified. However, the requested funding of $7,900 for this project was only partially supported by the Panel in that it agreed to provide $4,400 to pay the wages of the story tellers. The cost of the travel to and from Kintore was not supported.

CATHOLIC SCHOOLS

14. * ALICE SPRINGS CATHOLIC HIGH SCHOOL, ALICE SPRINGS, N.T.

The projects at the school are known as the Development of Arrente Curriculum for Year 9 and Extension of Year 8 Arrente Projects. The school aimed to develop the curriculum through the printing of materials and the payment of linguists and experts assisting with the course. Arrente had been a compulsory Year 8 subject in the school for the past six years. The application was for the expansion of the program. The requested funding of $6,435 was initially set aside, reason not specified. However, it was reconsidered and supported with the proviso that staff appointed be appropriately qualified; that the project have Aboriginal control or involvement and that progress reports be submitted.
This group used part of its NALP funds to pay consultancy fees to the Institute for Aboriginal Development in Alice Springs.

15. * ALICE SPRINGS CATHOLIC HIGH SCHOOL, N.T.

The requested funding of $8,020 was initially set aside by the Panel in that it considered that the Catholic system should provide adequate resources to meet the needs of the children it teaches. However, the Panel reconsidered the application and supported the proposal with the same provisos as that applying to the school's Arrente programme. The school while appreciative of NALP funds had explained that the money was inadequate to release the Co-ordinator of the Ntyarlke unit to work full time in the unit.

16. BILIR NAGAWIWU CATHOLIC SCHOOL, KIMBERLEY, W.A.

This proposal, known as the Jaru Language Education Program, was a joint submission from the school and the Kundat Jaru Community. The community has requested that their children be taught Jaru and English. Although no letter of support was received from the Community's Chairperson, 23 community members indicated their support of it. The proposal sought to facilitate the recording of traditional stories; the writing of the language; the construction of books, dictionary and other language resources; and to assist with the training of Aboriginal teachers. The requested funding of $17,524 was not, however, fully supported by the Panel as it considered some of the activities to be in the form of retrospective payment. The Panel agreed to provide $7,000 for the production of Jaru books and the Jaru teaching program. It is not clear how this money was to be allocated but it would seem to indicate $4000 for printing and $3,000 for equipment.

17. JOHN PUJAJANGKA-PIYIRN SCHOOL, KIMBERLEY, W.A.

The proposal, known as the Walmajarri Language Maintenance Project, was designed to assist Lake Gregory children speak and write the Walmajarri language and provide assistance to the school's Language Workers. It was envisaged that three Language Workers would attend the school each week. A linguist would also be invited to work with the language workers in order that the language was correctly written. Audio tapes and books would be produced. The requested funding of $2,000 for staffing was supported by the Panel which indicated that the school should reapply for funding in 1989/90.

INDEPENDENT ABORIGINAL SCHOOLS

18. BARANGU SCHOOL, KATHERINE, N.T.

We are uncertain of what this project entailed as we did not received the application for funding from DEET. According to the NALP minutes the requested funding of $4,700 was not totally supported by the Panel which

believed that only the salary component of the submission should be funded. We are unaware of how the project is proceeding.

19. * YIPIRINYA SCHOOL COUNCIL INC., ALICE SPRINGS, N.T.

The project, known as the Caterpillar Sites Resource Kits Project, is to be conducted over a three month period. Visits will be conducted to relevant sites with senior traditional owners to record information through video, audio and photographic means. The text will be transcribed into Mparntwe Arrente and then into Western Arrente, Luritja and English. Various graded versions will be produced. The written texts will be illustrated by traditional artists. Books will be produced and material collated into three kits, one for each of the vernacular programmes. The materials will be evaluated through the children's level of enjoyment of the materials; the teacher's assessment of increased literacy skills and the traditional owners assessment of how well the children know the stories. The requested funding of $30,485 was not fully supported by the Panel. It agreed to fund the salaries of translators, transcribers, traditional owners, and artists [$28,500] but declined to fund equipment costs, artistic materials and production costs. By late October 1989, the project had not commenced due to the death of one of the traditional owners of the Caterpillar Dreaming. It may be some months before the project starts.

20. YIYILI ABORIGINAL COMMUNITY SCHOOL, KIMBERLEY, W.A.

The proposal, had two components: the Gooniyandi Language Maintenance Project and the Kriol Oracy and Literacy Program. At Yiyili both languages are taught in the school with Kriol being the children's first language. Students receive between thirty and sixty minutes of formal instruction in Kriol each day from three Aboriginal teaching Assistants who are fluent and literate in Kriol. Gooniyandi is taught for two hours per week by two Aboriginal Teaching Assistants with the majority of the work being covered orally. However, written materials are being developed including song sheets and games. The requested funding of $29,100 received only partial support from the Panel who accepted the Gooniyandi Project but not the Kriol Program. Funding of $15,000 was provided for the salaries of two Gooniyandi teachers and a half time resource person.

ABORIGINAL LANGUAGE/EDUCATION CENTRES

21. * ADULT EDUCATION CENTRE, BELYUEN, N.T.

The project, known as the Batjamal and Ami Literature Project, was initiated by a group of language speakers after an SAL [Batchelor] language maintenance course in

1987. The project aimed to collect oral literature in the two languages through tape recordings and to test the written system for the languages. Printed copies of materials would then be prepared for use in the school and Adult Education Centre. Letters of support from the President of the Belyuen Community Council and Coordinator of the Adult Education Centre were included with promises of accommodation for the linguist made by the Council. The requested funding of $3,790, of which $3,000 was to be spent on Aboriginal speakers was supported by the Panel. No reasons for this decision was given.

22. * DJABUGAY GU:L [SCHOOL] AND LANGUAGE RESOURCE CENTRE, KURANDA, QLD.

The proposal had three components. Firstly to write a language text book and make tapes [six months]; secondly to produce a collection of stories in Djabugay [six months] and thirdly to prepare lessons and develop curriculum [twelve months]. Its aims were to provide the community with access to Djabugay through courses, text books, literature, tapes and games thus preserving for future generations a language threatened with extinction. [currently twenty speakers]. This in turn would establish a base for an Aboriginal programme related to the area. It was asserted that ultimately the project would become a source of inspiration to local artists, writers and musicians. DEET had until November 1988 funded five community language courses paying for tutors, teachers and artists. However, they were unable to pay for lesson preparation and course development as the funding received were from DEET sources other than NALP. The Centre has also obtained funding from the Aboriginal Arts Board for a Djabugay text book. The success of the program has led to the introduction of Djabugay at the Kuranda State School. The Panel considered the application to be the best and most soundly conceived of the three applications relevant to Djabugay [the others being from the Kuranda School and the Ngoonbi Cooperative] and supported full funding of $24,000 [staffing $21,000 and equipment $3,000] subject to appropriate Aboriginal controls being established.

23. * KIMBERLEY LANGUAGE RESOURCE CENTRE, HALLS CREEK, W.A.

The proposal, known as the KLRC Fitzroy Crossing Annex, was a three year project to establish an annex of the KLRC at Fitzroy Crossing. Its aims were primarily language maintenance, but also it planned to develop bilingual education programs and produce language books. Eight languages would be assisted [Walmatjarri, Bunaba, Gooniyandi, Wangkatjunga, Nyikina, Mangala, Kija and Juwaliny]. Administrative and production costs for the project would be born by the KLRC at Halls Creek. The

submission stressed the need to record those languages in most immediate danger of extinction. Its educational thrust would be centred on three broad areas: bilingual education, language maintenance and language renewal. The requested funding of $63,102 was treated by the Panel as a distinct project rather than as part from the KLRC in Halls Creek. It supported all aspects of the proposal except for the planning of bilingual education. It agreed to provide funding of $55,000 on the basis that only half the vehicle costs be supported and that there be some trimming of salaries recruitment and reallocation costs [Salaries $51,262, vehicle costs $3,738].

24. * PAPULU APARR-KARRI LANGUAGE CENTRE, TENNANT CREEK, N.T.

In considering the requested funding of $104,387, the Panel noted that the final report for the project was not due until 12 September 1989 although the Centre's funding was due to expire on 30 June 1989. The Centre required interim funding until a new submission was considered in late 1989. The Panel therefore supported partial funding of $50,000 in two parts. One being $34,000 to cover the Centre until the final report was received and the other being for $16,000 once a satisfactory report was received. It also recommended that the Centre's Research Coordinator be funded at the reduced rate of $20,000 per annum. The balance of $54,387 would be considered in late 1987. No request for an interim progress report was made.

25. * PILBARA ABORIGINAL LANGUAGE CENTRE, HEDLAND, W.A.

The proposal was to assist in the continuation of the Language Centre's work which supports twenty five local languages. The aims of the proposal were: to train Aboriginal people in language work; support existing language work in the region; record and store information about local languages; assist those people wanting to teach Aboriginal languages and to provide a forum through which Aboriginal people could decide on language policy. The submission also drew attention to the Centre's 'Objects of Incorporation' which elaborated on the above aims. The submission gave the Panel some choices as to the method of support which included the appointment of male and female linguists. However, the requested funding of $105,900 was only partially supported by the Panel. It decided not to support the option of a male and female linguist and would not support the costs of the Centre's Management Committee. Funding of $80,000 was provided of which $56,000 was allocated for salaries.

In visiting with the Centre, the linguist had discussed the difficulties in working as a linguist and also essentially performing the role of co-ordinator. Through the Commonwealth Employment Service and one of its

trainee programs the Centre had procured a subsidy for a co-ordinator for six months.

26. * THOORGHINE EDUCATIONAL CULTURE CENTRE, HERVEY BAY, QLD.

The proposal, known as the Language for the Future Project, was to revive and maintain the Dippil language through school based education and pre school enrichment programs. The proposal included the appointment of a Coordinator/teacher [$20,000] and travel and accommodation costs of $6000 of which $4,000 was allocated for visits to Maningrida, a sistership tribe. However, the requested funding of $30,000 was not fully supported by the Panel which believed that much of the proposed budget was outside the NALP guidelines. However, it felt that the recording of the Dippil language was of importance and recommended partial funding of $10,000 to collect as much of the language as possible from remaining speakers.

ABORIGINAL COUNCILS/CORPORATIONS/COMMITTEES

27. * ABORIGINAL EDUCATION CONSULTATIVE GROUP, SYDNEY, N.S.W.

The above organization put in two submissions. The first, budgeted at $112,000, and known as the Traditional Aboriginal Languages of NSW Project, was to provide greater access for NSW Aborigines to their traditional languages by developing a service for the recording of languages and the development of learning resources. It also aimed at providing support for those Aboriginal communities and individuals who wished to work on their local language and at promoting the recognition and use of traditional NSW Aboriginal languages. The second submission was for $54,800 for an Aboriginal English Research Project which aimed at developing approaches, teaching strategies and resources for the development of the language. The Panel did not support the Aboriginal English submission as it was regarded outside the NALP guidelines. The first submission was seen as important but lacked detail both in its funding and processes. However, the Panel agreed to provide $25,000 for the employment of one researcher whose job would be to contact each of the main language groups to ascertain their condition and assess the needs and priorities. No equipment, accommodation, travel or other costs would be met. At the time of our visit the project had only recently received its funding. The Group is currently restructuring the project and have just appointed a research officer and an assistant to undertake research over the next four months.

28. ABORIGINAL LANGUAGES ASSOCIATION [ALA]

The proposal was to establish an office for the Association together with a Coordinator/Language Worker at a central location where language activities were occurring. The Office would provide assistance, support and research advice to all Aboriginal communities throughout Australia involved or interested in developing language programs. The Office would also distribute information through newsletters and other methods. It was not stipulated where it would be located. The requested funding of $55,200 however, was only partially supported by the Panel who considered the Minister would not approve the proposal on the basis that NALP funding was not provided to support interest groups. The Panel considered that funding could be supported in order that the ALA could provide feedback and consultation on the need for Aboriginal language maintenance, development and revival and also suggest future directions for NALP. It suggested that one of the recommendations emerging from this consultative process might be that ALA establish a permanent office. This in turn would provide AACLAME with a further source of policy advice. It was also noted that such a consultative process could be funded through other DEET programs. We are unclear of the funding position of this project as we have been advised that it received $15,000 and we have also been advised that its submission was unsuccesful.

29. * BIDYADANGA COMMUNITY, NEAR BROOME, W.A.

The proposal, known as the Traditional Aboriginal Languages Project, was to assist in the maintenance of five languages [Nyangumarta, Yulparija, Karajarri, Juwaliny and Mangala] through the development of language resources. These resources were to be developed through language excursions. The project was to centre around the activities of the school. In considering the requested funding of $13,000 the Panel noted that the project had already attracted support from other sources. However, it agreed to provide partial funding of $7,000 but rejected the requested funding for inter-school meetings, conferences and a laminating machine. This project had not started at the time of our visit [October 1989] on the basis that the Community Council had not been informed that funding had been approved.

30. * BUNBURY ABORIGINAL PROGRESS ASSOCIATION, BUNBURY, W.A.

This proposal was a request for continuing funding for the Nyungar Language Project which involved a Nyungar language research project and the development of two language kits. The second language kit would be an extension of the first while the research project was considered important due to the urgent need to interview old language speakers. The Association included in its application a very detailed report of its activities.

However, the requested funding of $31,495 was in fact overstated in the application [the figure actually being $30,595 - see section 11, Budget Part One]. The Panel was not advised of this error by DEET prior to making its recommendation for full funding of $31,495.

31. DARETON ABORIGINAL YOUTH DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION, DARETON, N.S.W.

The proposal, known as the Barkindji Revival Project, was to provide initial research into the status of the Barkindji language in the NSW Darling River towns and gather resources for use in workshops which would teach the language to adults and children. In this way the project hoped to encourage and channel community interest in maintaining the language of which only five speakers remain in the community. The Panel in considering the application believed the proposal to be a little amorphous. However, the research element was considered important and a crucial first step in the revival of the language. The Panel subsequently agreed to fully fund the proposal for $11,813.

32. GAIRE KAWAU ORGANIZATION, CAIRNS, QUEENSLAND.

The proposal, known as the Language Revival Project, was to assist Torres strait Islander children maintain their language and identity while living in the Cairns region. It also aimed at providing an opportunity for TSI community members to become involved in the planning, implementation and control of the project. The requested funding of $44,000 was only partially supported by the Panel. It saw the proposal as important and agreed to provide funding for salaries [$24,000] stationery [$1,500] and partial travel [$500]. Although this amounted to $26,000, the Panel only recommended $25,000. No explanation for this is available in the Panel's minutes. The Panel also suggested to Gaire Kawau that funding for office rental, furniture, etc. might be obtained from DAA or DCS.

33. GURRABUNYA CULTURE CAMP, ROEBOURNE, PILBARA, W.A.

This proposal, known as the Gurrabunya Language Project, was to train younger people to read and write Yirdjibarndi and Ngarluma through an informal culture camp educational setting. Stories would be told by the older people and recorded. A supervisor would be paid for twelve weeks to prepare materials and to focus on language teaching methods. The culture camp would run throughout the year. The requested funding of $12,000, including $7,500 for staffing was supported by the Panel. No reason was given for this decision in the Panel's minutes.

34. * GUMBAYNGGIRR LANGUAGE AND CULTURE GROUP,KEMPSEY, N.S.W.

This proposal, known as the Traineeship in Language Maintenance Project, was to learn to speak and write Gumbaynggirr and to link the language with the culture. It proposed to develop educational materials for primary schools and community education through stories, songs and conversation and to help introduce these materials into both a community education project and the Bowraville School. The Panel considered the proposal to be well conceived but believed that the trainee envisaged for the project would need considerable assistance from a skilled person. It also felt, that given the small number of elderly Gumbaynggirr speakers left [twelve in total] the research component should be given greater immediate priority. The requested funding of $33,860 was fully supported by the Panel on the proviso that the emphasis be on the research component. It also recommended that the Group be advised that there was no guarantee of further funding.

35. * GURUNGU COUNCIL ABORIGINAL CORPORATION, ELLIOT, N.T.

This proposal, known as the Jingilu - Mutbura - Wombaiya Languages Maintenance Project 1989, was to help maintain the Jingilu and Mutbura languages in the Elliot community and to collect a detailed record of all three languages. It also planned to produce books and videos for use in language maintenance programs in Elliot. The requested funding of $23,050 was not completely supported by the Panel which agreed to provide $22,550 [$500 for administration being denied]. At the time of our visit, the program had not started. Discussions were taking place to reorient the program to accommodate three speakers for twenty weeks rather than the proposed two speakers for thirty weeks, in order to cover all three language areas. The project was requiring assistance from the Language Centre at Tennant Creek.

36. INJILINJI CORPORATION, MOUNT ISA, QUEENSLAND.

This proposal, known as the Kalkadoon Revival Project, was to encourage the preservation of the Kalkadoon language through the development of a language course of fifteen hours a week for thirty two weeks for ten people. These people would then act as Instructors in the Kalkadoon language. The Panel was impressed by the strong community support for the project [one letter of support from the Kalkadoon Tribal Council was received] and the evidence of fruitful negotiations with the local TAFE College and High School. The Panel considered that the

Corporation should work with the school in order that its program become an integral part of the school curriculum. The requested funding of $33,486 was only partially supported by the Panel which reduced travel by $1,000 and did not support administrative costs. It also decided that workers compensation and payroll tax should come from within the salary allocation. Workers compensation costs were generally accepted by the Panel. This was an exception. Plans for the future include evening classes for those people who work during the day; the taping of stories known by the old people and the development of resource materials. At the time of our interview the project had been running for only two months.

37. * JARNDU YAWURU WOMEN'S GROUP, BROOME, KIMBERLEY, W.A.

This proposal, known as the Yawuru Language, Culture and History Project, was a request for further funding to record, foster and maintain Yawuru language, culture and history [only thirty speakers remain]. This was to be achieved by developing programs and activities where the language, culture and history could be learnt as it had been in the past. Materials were also to be produced. The proposal stressed that it would be totally Aboriginal managed and controlled. The requested funding of $48,000 was not, however, fully supported by the Panel on the basis that its report was not due until the end of May. However, the Panel agreed to provide $10,000 in order that the project could complete its first stage. Consideration for further funding would be given in late 1989.

38. KALKARINGI/DAGURAGU R.A.T.E. STUDENTS, KALKARINGI, N.T.

This proposal, known as the Developing a Gurindji Language Curriculum and Gurindji Language Maintenance project, was to develop a language curriculum at Kalkaringi School and record traditional stories, songs and dances. It also aimed at developing the Gurindji literacy skills of Remote Area Teacher Education [RATE] Students and Aboriginal Assistant Teachers. The requested funding of $98,343 was not, however, fully supported by the Panel as it considered the training of RATE Students and Aboriginal Assistant Teachers as the province of other funding sources. It decided to support the language curriculum and the recording aspects of the submission and provided funding of $30,000 to meet the costs of a teacher/linguist. As of October 1989, this position had not been filled.

39. KOMBUMERRI ABORIGINAL CORPORATION, BRISBANE, N.S.W.

Three proposals were received from this group which were treated as one by the Panel. The Corporation decided to

prioritise their proposals as follows: firstly, the Northern Bundjalung Language Program, secondly the Southern Bundjalung Language Project and thirdly, the development of a Bundjalung language textbook. A rationale was put forward by the Corporation for this priority. In considering the requested funding of $20,944, the Panel saw the development of the language text book as being of the greatest priority with the work being undertaken by the Aboriginal Research Centre at Monash University, Victoria. Funding of $13,138 was approved of which $9,090 was for an Aboriginal linguist to develop the preliminary chapters of the text book over a three month period. The Panel also agreed to fund $2,240 in air fares and $1,508 in related costs including $300 to a fluent speaker to assist and provide stories and information to the linguist. At the time of our visit there were approximately thirty people involved in language classes. The group had discussions with DEET, Canberra regarding the use of funds and were told to go ahead with language classes and resource development if that was seen to be the group's priorities.

40. * KWOMBOM ABORIGINAL CORPORATION, ADELAIDE RIVER, N.T.

This proposal, known as the Maramanindji Language Project, was to record and write the Maramanindji Language. It aimed at encouraging the Maramanindji people to learn about their language, culture and history and thus develop a sense of identity and pride. It stated that educational materials would be produced to assist in the teaching of the language. Only six speakers are left. The proposed project was to have five stages: the development of an orthography; the construction of a word list; the production of a "Guide to Speaking"; the placement of all materials on computer; the development of a small booklet and the development of teaching workshops. A full time linguist would be employed for twelve weeks together with part time Aboriginal Instructors. The requested funding of $13,000 was only partially supported by the Panel which did not support the funding of airfares. It agreed to provide $12,000. The project was late in starting as the Offer of Acceptance went missing. As of October 1989, the project had not started.

41. * MIRIMA COUNCIL, KUNUNURRA, WESTERN AUSTRALIA

The project aims at promoting the Miriwoong and Gajirrawoong languages. The Council asked for $87,208 and received $10,000. We have not been provided with the Council submission.

42. * NGUIU/BATHURST ISLAND COUNCIL, BATHURST ISLAND, NORTHERN TERRITORY.

This proposal, known as the Language and Culture Project, was designed to keep the Tiwi language strong through the teaching of the language to women over the age of sixteen. This would assist in the maintenance of language and culture and respect for Tiwi values. Three courses were planned of ten weeks duration [three x three hours per week]. The panel considered that the submission was sound and agreed to full funding of $8,585.
This project had not started at the time of our visit as the person who would be a part-time teacher with the project had taken the temporary position of liaison officer with the local school and was wanting to complete her time at the school before beginning the project.

43. * NYINKKANYUNYU SCHOOL COUNCIL, TENNANT CREEK, N.T.

The proposal, known as the Nyinkkanyunyu School Language Program, was to educate Aboriginal children the way their parents requested. It involved developing an oral language program for children starting with Warumungu and extending the program to cover Warlpiri and Warlmanpa. It also included running workshops for adults in the three languages mentioned plus Alyawarre, Wambaya Wakaya, Yanyala and Garrawe, a total of eight languages. However, the requested funding of $95,454 was not fully supported by the Panel. It noted that the proposal was tied in with the Remote Area Teacher Education Program [RATE] and that the proposal had requested funding for more than twelve months. It agreed to support the appointment of a full time language research person and the development of the Warumungu curriculum and provided $30,000 for this purpose.

44. PEPPIMENARTI COMMUNITY COUNCIL, PEPPIMENARTI, N.T.

This proposal, known as the Ngan'gikurunggurr and Ngan'giwumirri Language maintenance Program, was a request for recurrent funding to assemble a collection of videos of the vernacular language which would form a resource library for community and school use. The requested funding of $5,500 was supported by the Panel which increased the amount to $6,000 to cover the payment of Aboriginal advisers. This was the only project where the Panel increased the amount requested.

45. * WARRMARN COMMUNITY, TURKEY CREEK, KIMBERLEY, W.A.

This proposal, known as the Kija Language Program, was to establish a program for the learning and teaching of the Kija language which would enhance the status of the language and bridge communication gaps. It planned to develop and produce written and visual records and materials in the language including cassette and video tapes and photographs. The program was a request from the young adults [12 to 40 year of age] of the community and was seen as separate from the language program

undertaken in the school. There would be two organised groups, one for the men and one for the women. The Panel considered the submission along with that received from the school based Kija Language Group and opted for the community proposal in that it targeted young people. However, the Panel did not agree to fully fund the project. The requested $39,158 was trimmed to $30,000. No indication was given for this decision and no advice given as to what aspects of the funding proposal was to be eliminated. As of October 1989 the project had not commenced as the community was having difficulty employing a linguist.

ADULT EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS

46. ABORIGINAL RESEARCH CENTRE, MONASH UNIVERSITY, VICTORIA.

The proposal involved a feasibility study for the parameters for a major project in the area of Aboriginal languages. The Panel noted that research had been undertaken in Broome, Alice Springs and Brisbane through a $40,000 grant from the Commonwealth Schools Commission. However, it agreed that the examination of a further community would be useful in order to examine the components of success in teaching Aboriginal languages in schools. It considered that a South Australian school might be appropriate. It recommended funding of $10,000 for unspecified purposes for this proposal on the proviso that Monash University did not receive credit for the work. The reason for this was not explained.

47. * GERALDTON REGIONAL COMMUNITY EDUCTION CENTRE, GERALDTON, W.A.

This proposal, known as the Watjarri Renewal Programme, was to expand the Watjarri resources available in written, video, audio form. It also planned to develop curriculum materials for use in schools and communities and to involve itself in the professional development of teachers in schools by assisting them to develop effective teaching strategies with the materials. The proposal was to involve Aboriginal people in the planning, implementation, development and evaluation of the project. However, the requested funding of $73,000 was not fully supported by the Panel. It believed that the professional development of teachers fell outside the NALP guidelines. It agreed to provide funding of $28,000 for the employment of a linguist, part time clerical assistant and language advisors only and then on the proviso that the project would undertake the research requested by the Tardun people in their submission which was to identify community members with knowledge of the language, conduct recorded interviews and produce a Language Teaching Package.

The Centre had lost the person who had originally intended to be the project's linguist due to the time lag between submitting an application and receiving approval for funds. The group expected a linguist to start in November or December 1989 and work for six months in 1990.

48. * INSTITUTE FOR ABORIGINAL DEVELOPMENT, ALICE SPRINGS, N.T.

The proposal, known as the Pertame Language Maintenance Project, was made on behalf of the Pertame speakers of Alice Springs. It was designed to raise awareness in the Pertame community of the language's rapid loss and to record it on tape and in writing to ensure that the language would not be lost. Currently only fifty speakers exist. It aimed to involve as many Pertame speakers as possible in the project. However, the requested funding of $26,269 was not fully supported by the Panel which did not support the provisions made for administrative fees and the purchase of tapes. It also did not support travel costs. The Panel agreed to provide funding of $22,000 for the employment of a researcher and informants only.

49. * INSTITUTE FOR ABORIGINAL DEVELOPMENT, ALICE SPRINGS, N.T.

The proposal, known as the Vernacular Literature for an Anmatyerr Community School Project, was made on behalf of the Yuelama Community at Mt Allen. It was designed to improve the prestige of the Anmatyerr language in the Mt Allan Community by encouraging Anmatyerr people to learn to read and write their own language. It aimed to preserve Anmatyerr stories and enable Warlpiri and Anmatyerr language materials to be used in the Mt Allan School. The requested funding of $15,130 was only partially supported by the Panel. It agreed to fund the staffing component of $13,800 but not the travel [$1050] and equipment [$280] costs.

50. LA TROBE UNIVERSITY, VICTORIA.

The proposal, known as the Nyulnyul, A Dying Language of Beagle Bay Project, was to gather information on the grammar, culture and Socio-Linguistics of the language. It aimed at producing materials in the language which would be used by children and others interested in learning the language. It proposed to prepare a data base of information on all aspects of the language and prepare, for eventual publication, an encyclopedic grammar and dictionary of the language. It was noted that possibly only five speakers remain. The project was considered important by the Panel. However, the requested funding of $34,000 was only partially supported as computer and software costs of $5,000 were rejected. An

allocation of $28,000 was subsequently made which included salaries of $22,200 and travel costs of $5,800.

PRIVATE COMPANIES

51. * CENTRAL AUSTRALIAN ABORIGINAL MEDIA ASSOCIATION, ALICE SPRINGS, N.T.

The proposal involved the production and broadcasting of radio and television programs in Aboriginal languages. It aimed to support, maintain and elevate the status of Aboriginal languages in central Australia by providing relevant and appropriate services to the remote communities. Although the Panel supported the project in principal, the requested funding of $59,400 was only partially supported. Equipment hire, fax machine, telephone, freight, secretarial and accounting costs were not supported. The Panel however agree to provide $39,200 to the Association's Language Service Department to cover the costs of producing radio and especially TV programs.

52. * MAGABALA BOOKS, BROOME, KIMBERLEY, W.A.

The proposal, known as the Yawuru Seasons Kit, State 2 project, was to assist in the publication of it. The publishing house asserted that the kit would provide excellent resource materials and enhance community involvement. The requested funding of $3,850 was supported by the Panel. It had received excellent reports on the work already completed.

PRIVATE INDIVIDUALS

53. JOSIE BOYLE, PERTH, WESTERN AUSTRALIA

The proposal was to ensure that all Wonggutha [or Wongatha] language was recorded. It involved trips to Wiluna and Laverton and the development of a thesis on the structure of the language and a dictionary. It also aimed at writing 7,000 words in every day speech. The application was a request for the project to be refunded at a cost of $20,000. The Panel considered the project to be a priority and agreed to full funding. However, it is not clear from the documentation of the application how the figure of $20,000 was arrived at.

APPENDIX TWO

FUNDING ANALYSIS OF NALP PROJECTS

N.A.L.P. FUNDING ANALYSIS

APPENDIX TWO

	TOTAL	TOT/PROG	STAFF	STFF/TOT	TRAVEL	EQUIPMENT	PRINTING	ACCOMOD.	STATIONERY	RUNNING	NOT SPEC.	OTHER
	$	%	$	%	$	$	$	$	$	$	$	$
SCHOOLS												
STATE SCHOOLS												
Arakun School	13537										13537	
Coconut Island	19100		15000		1900	1000	1200					
Doon Doon Prim	12000		9000		1000			2000				
Kaurna Plains	36000		30000		1000		5000					
Murray Island	15000		15000									
S.A. Ed. Dept.	29648		29648									
Stephen Island	7150		4500		650	1000	1000					
T.I. High Sch	7337				3500	2837	1000					
T.I. State Sch	17000		17000									
Walungurru	4400		4400									
Mossman Gorge	2630		2130		500							
S.A. Ed. Dept.	25000		20800		1500		1200	1500				
State Bd Vic	10000		10000									
	198802	19.9%	157478	58.6%	10050	4837	9400	3500	0	0	13537	0
CATHOLIC SCHOOLS												
Alice Sprgs HS	8020										8020	
Alice Sprgs HS	6435		4235		250		1000		950			
Bilir Nagawiwu	7000					3000	4000					
John Pujajanga	2000		2000									
	23455	2.3%	6235	2.3%	250	3000	5000	0	950	0	8020	0
INDEPENDENT SCHOOLS												
Barangu	3200		3200									
Yipirinya	28500		28500									
Yiyili	15000		15000									
	46700	4.7%	46700	17.4%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SUB-TOTAL SCHOOL	268957	26.9%	210413	78.2%	10300	7837	14400	3500	950	0	21557	0

	TOTAL	TOT/PROG	STAFF	STFF/TOT	TRAVEL	EQUIPMENT	PRINTING	ACCOMOD.	STATIONERY	RUNNING	NOT SPEC.	OTHER
	$	%	$	%	$	$	$	$	$	$	$	$
AB. LANG./ED CENTRES												
Belyuen	3790		3000		360	180	250					
Djabugay Gu:L	24000		21000			3000						
K.L.R.C.	55000		51262		3738							
Papulu Aparr-K	50000										50000	
P.A.L.C.	80000		56000		9000	2300				11200		1500
Thoorghine	10000										10000	
	222790	22.3%	131262	58.9%	13098	5480	250	0	0	11200	60000	1500
AB. COMMUN/CORP												
Bidyadanga	7000		1000		3500	550	1000		450		500	
Bunbury	31495		2975		2000	1100	24270			1150		
Dareton	11813		8768		1500	680			360	505		
Gaire Kawah	25000		23000		500				1500			
Garrabunya	12000		7500		2500	1000	1000					
Gumbaynggirr	33860		22430		3000	3500				2430		2500
Gurungu	22550		18000		1000	2800	750					
Injilinji	25000										25000	
Jarndu Yawuru	10000										10000	
Kalkaringi	30000		30000									
Kumbumerri	13100		9390		2760			750		200		
Kwombom	12000		10560		1000				440			
Mirima	10000										10000	
NSWAECG	25000		25000									
Nguiu	8585		4608			2465			1512			
Nyinkkanyunyu	30000		30000									
Peppimenarti	6000		1550		1172	3278						
Warrmarn	30000										30000	
	343403	34.3%	194781	56.7%	18932	15373	27020	750	4262	4285	75500	2500

	TOTAL	TOT/PROG	STAFF	STFF/TOT	TRAVEL	EQUIPMENT	PRINTING	ACCOMOD.	STATIONERY	RUNNING	NOT SPEC.	OTHER
	$	%	$	%	$	$	$	$	$	$	$	$
ADULT EDUCATION INSTITUTION												
Geraldton	28000		28000									
IAD (Pertame)	22000		22000									
IAD (Yuglama)	13800		13800									
LA Trobe	28000		22200		5800							
Monash	10000										10000	
	101800	10.2%	86000	84.5%	5800	0	0	0	0	0	10000	0
PRIVATE COMPANIES & INDIVIDUALS												
C.A.A.M.A.	39200										39200	
Magabala	3850		1000		250				500	2100		
Josie Boyle	20000										20000	
	63050	6.3%	1000	1.6%	250	0	0	0	500	2100	59200	0
PROGRAM TOTAL	1000000		623456	62.3%	48380	28690	41670	4250	5712	17585	226257	4000

APPENDIX THREE

LANGUAGES THAT HAVE BENEFITED FROM THE NALP PROGRAM

As far as we have been able to ascertain the following 91 languages were assisted through the programme in 1988/89. It is possible that other languages have also been assisted as we have been unable to obtain a full list of funded projects.

. Aboriginal English
. Alyawarra
. Ami
. Anmatyerr
. Arrente
. Barkindji
. Batjamal
. Bunaba
. Bundjalung
. Dalabon
. Dippil
. Djabugay
. Eastern Arrente
. English
. Gajirrawong
. Garrawe
. Gooniyandi
. Gumbaynggirr
. Gurindji
. Jaru
. Jawoyn
. Jingulu
. Jiwarli
. Jurruru
. Juwarliny
. Kaititj
. Kalaw Gawa Ya
. Kalkadoon
. Kalaw Lagaw Ya
. Karajarri
. Kariyara
. Kartujarra
. Kija
. Kriol
. Kuku Yalanji
. Kurrama
. Luritja

. Mangarla
. Manjiljarra
. Maramanidji
. Martuthunira
. Martuwangka
. Meriam [or Miriam] Mer
. Miriwung
. Mparntwe Arrernte
. Mutbura
. Narrunga
. Narrindjerri
. Ngan'gikurunggurr
. Ngan'giwumirri
. Ngarla
. Ngarluma
. Nhuwala
. Nyamal
. Nyangumarta
. Nyikina
. Nyiyaparli
. Nyulnyul
. Nyungar
. Palyku
. Panyjima
. Pertame
. Pinikura
. Pintupi
. Pitjantjatjarra
. Purduna
. Putijarra
. Thiin
. Tiwi
. Torres Straits Creole
. Wakaya
. Walmajarri
. Wambaya
. Wangkatjunga
. Warlpiri
. Warlmanpa
. Warnman
. Warumungu
. Watjarri
. Western Anmatyerr
. Western Arrernte
. Western Language
. Wombaiya
. Wongatha
. Woolah
. Yanyala
. Yawuru
. Yindjibarndi
. Yinhawangka
. Yulparija
. Yura Ngawarla

APPENDIX FOUR

PROPOSALS NOT FUNDED

A total of 40 proposals were not supported by the NALP Assessment Panel. These involved the following;

State Schools/Education Departments	2
Catholic Schools	3
Independent Aboriginal Schools	2
Aboriginal Language/Education Centres	7
Aboriginal Councils/Corporations/Committees	14
Adult Education Institutions	7
Private Companies	3
Private Individuals	2
TOTAL	40

STATE SCHOOLS

KURANDA STATE SCHOOL, KURANDA, QUEENSLAND.

The proposal was to develop the Djabugay language as a second language. However, the requested funding of $7,210 was not supported as the Panel considered the Djabugay Gul Language Resource Centre's submission was better in that it involved greater community involvement. Kuranda State School's submission was one of three involving the Djabugay language, the other being from the Ngoonbi Cooperative which was also rejected in favour of the Djabugay proposal.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN EDUCATION DEPARTMENT, ADELAIDE, S.A.

The proposal known as the Aboriginal Languages Program was submitted through the Aboriginal Education Team of the Southern Area Education Office. The requested funding of $26,320 was to be used to design Aboriginal first language maintenance/development programmes for specific Primary Schools; to resource and implement these programmes and to train Aboriginal adults to become Aboriginal language instructors. The proposal was rejected on the grounds that it was seen to be of lower priority than other South Australian proposals. The panel supported in principal the training of Aboriginal language instructors.

CATHOLIC SCHOOLS

KURRUNGKU CATHOLIC SCHOOL, BILLILUNA, KIMBERLEY, W.A.

The proposal, known as the Walmajarri Language Maintenance Program, was to develop and maintain children's self-esteem, their pride in local culture and their sense of identity through the school's language program which has daily language lessons of 30 minutes taught by Aboriginal teachers. The proposal also involved training Aboriginal teachers and community members in literacy and basic linguistic skills. This was to be to achieved through ten blocks of one week intensive workshops to assist Aboriginal teachers with their literacy skills and to provide a mini course in linguistics for Aboriginal teachers from Kurrungku, Luurnpa [Balgo] and Mulan [Lake Gregory] schools. The project received written support from the local Mindibingu Aboriginal Community Council. However, the requested funding of $13,230 was not supported as the panel considered that the Catholic system should support it. Moreover, the school was advised to share the work and resources already produced.

LUURNPA CATHOLIC SCHOOL, BALGO, KIMBERLEY, W.A.

The proposal, known as the Kukatja Literacy Programme, was a request for ongoing funding for a project supported by the NALP Assessment Panel in 1987/88. A progress Report on the project was included with the application which asserted that the language maintenance programs at Luurnpa, Kurrungku [Billiluna] and Mulan [Lake Gregory] were progressing very well. It included written letters of support from the Chairman of the Balgo Hills Community Aboriginal Corporation and the Chairman of the Luurnpa School Board. In this instance the Panel deferred its decision on the submission until late 1989 on the basis that the project's final report was not due until October 1989.

WARLAWURRU CATHOLIC SCHOOL, HALLS CREEK, KIMBERLEY, W.A.

The proposal, known as the Aboriginal Language Schools Program, was primarily for the employment of an Aboriginal Language Worker together with printing costs. The project involved working with community elders in obtaining knowledge of the Jaru language assisted by the linguistic expertise available through the Kimberley Language Centre. The aim was to develop written materials which could be used in the school. However, the requested funding of $18,397 was not supported by the NALP Assessment Panel. Although no specific reason was given,

the Panel believed the school should be advised to use the resources of the Kimberley Language Centre.

INDEPENDENT ABORIGINAL SCHOOLS

STRELLEY COMMUNITY SCHOOL, PILBARA, W.A.

The proposal, submitted by the Nomads Charitable and Educational Foundation and known as the Warnman Literacy Programme, was to encourage the retention and future growth on the Warnman language through a number of specific objectives and to encourage trainees to look beyond basic linguistics to further study and professional development. However, the requested funding of $36,240 was not supported as the Panel considered that the activities described were already happening. This gave the proposal a lower priority.

KULKARRIYA COMMUNITY SCHOOL, NOONKANBAH, W.A.

The proposal was considered in conjunction with the Walmajarri submissions received from Kurrungku Catholic School [which was not supported on the basis that the Catholic system should support the proposal] and the John Pujajangka-Piyirn School [which was supported together with a suggestion to reapply for funding in 1989/90]. Kulkarriya's requested funding of $68,728 however was not supported by the Panel at this time as the project report was not due until 22 October 1989. The Panel decided to reconsider the application in late 1989.

ABORIGINAL LANGUAGE/EDUCATION/TRAINING CENTRES

ABORIGINAL TRAINING CENTRE, ARUKUN, QUEENSLAND.

The proposal, known as the Survival Maintenance Program, was to maintain the Wik Mungkan language by employing an Aboriginal Instructor; recording legends and songs; developing books, leaflets, newsletters and displays; collecting artifacts and creating videos of dancing singing and bush tucker. However, the requested funding of $25,500 was not supported as the Panel considered the project did not fit the NALP guidelines.

ARUKUN REGIONAL LANGUAGE RESOURCE CENTRE, QUEENSLAND.

The proposal, known as Language Maintenance at Arukun, was to provide language services and training in literacy work for Arukun and Cape York people and also to produce language materials. The requested funding of $50,000 was not supported as the Panel considered that Wik Mungkan was a relatively well documented language. This gave the proposal a lower priority. The Panel agreed to place the application first on its reserve list in the event of the

Minister rejecting any of its recommendations. However, this did not occur.

HOPEVALE LANGUAGE CENTRE, HOPEVALE, QUEENSLAND.

The proposal, known as the Guugu Yimithirr Language Centre, requested $95,000, primarily for staffing, to continue with its work. Unfortunately, the project funded initially in 1987/88, had in the meantime attracted strong criticism from the Principal of the Hope Vale State School asserting that money had been misappropriated. The Panel noted that a progress report for the project was not due until October 1989 and subsequently decided to defer funding the project until late 1989 when the application would again be considered. It also recommended that two of the NALP Panel visit Hopevale to investigate the complaints.

KALKADOON CULTURE EDUCATION CENTRE, MT ISA, QUEENSLAND.

The project, known as the Kalkadoon Language Revival Program, was to provide Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal children at Mount Isa Primary Schools with some understanding of the Kalkadoon language. This was to be achieved by gathering together language and stories from local elders and producing books, charts, posters etc. However, the requested funding of $32,900, was not supported as the Panel considered the project to be of low priority. Moreover, they were of the opinion that teaching Aboriginal languages to non-Aboriginal children was not a NALP priority.

NGUIU NGININGAWILA LITERATURE PRODUCTION CENTRE, BATHURST ISLAND, N.T.

The project, known as the Nginingawila Ngirramini Amintiya Yoyi, was to produce language development materials for Tiwi Students on Bathurst Island, specifically the creation of three videos, audio tapes and a large book of each story. It also aimed to involve adult Tiwi people more closely with the language development program within the school. However, the requested funding of $10,890 was not supported as the Panel considered that funding for the proposal should be the responsibility of the Northern Territory Department of Education.

SANTA TERESA LITERACY CENTRE, ALICE SPRINGS, N.T.

The proposal was for the running costs and staffing of the Santa Teresa Eastern Arrente Literacy Centre. The aims of the project included improving the fluency of children in Arrente; recording the history and culture of the local people and providing opportunities for Literacy Workers to practice their computing, graphic,

literacy and printing skills. The application for funding was endorsed by the President of the Santa Teresa Community Council. However, the requested funding of $14,000 was deferred by the Panel which expressed concern that the initial funding seemed to have been largely used for vehicle hire. It noted that it was aware that the first year's funding was for preparatory work and that this may have increased the cost of such hire. The Panel agreed to reconsider the application in late 1989.

WORAWA ABORIGINAL CENTRE, HEALESVILLE, VICTORIA.

The project aimed to establish a data base for Victorian Aboriginal languages and to revitalise them "as living social tools of discourse.." There was also to be biographies of Aboriginal Elders and the preservation of dreamtime and traditional stories. The requested funding of $64,319 was not supported as the Panel felt that some of the project's aims were difficult if not impossible to achieve and had doubts on whether Worawa was an acceptable location. It also believed the project lacked strong community support. Worawa was also considered to have existing adequate resources and could obtain funding from other sources. Moreover, it felt that other proposals had greater priority.

ABORIGINAL COUNCILS/CORPORATIONS/COMMITTEES

ALEKERENGE LANGUAGE COMMITTEE, ALICE SPRINGS, N.T.

This proposal was for further funding to continue the recording of Wakirti and Walpiri and to continue the involvement of those speakers in the school as instructors and teachers. The recording of the language and knowledge was to take place both in the school and during bush trips. Language materials was also to be developed for use in the school and in the home. However, the requested funding of $19,945 was not supported by the Panel at this time. It is noted that although the final report for the project was due on 12 May 1989 this had not been received at the time of the Panel's deliberations [21 June]. The Panel considered that there was no urgency to provide immediate additional funding and therefore deferred consideration of the application until late 1989.

ANGURUGU COMMUNITY GOVERNMENT COUNCIL, DARWIN, N.T.

This proposal, known as the Anindilyakwa Language Project, was designed to transcribe tape recorded discourses and prepare suitable stories for publication in the form of books and booklets. It also aimed at assisting in computerising an Anindilyakwa dictionary and preparing a monthly Anindilyakwa/English newsletter. However, the requested funding of $9,730 was not

supported as the panel considered that a large amount of Anindidyakwa linguistic work had already been completed.

BARWON ABORIGINAL COMMUNITY LIMITED, WALGETT, N.S.W.

The proposal, known as the Restoration of Ualoroi, Ngemba, and Gamilaroi Languages, was to video existing speakers and develop a series of books aimed at different ages and reading levels. It received funding of $15,000 from NALP in 1987/88. However, the requested funding of $58,000 was deferred by the Panel on the basis that the final report for the project was not due until late 1989.

IMANGARA LANGUAGE COMMITTEE, MURRAY DOWNS, N.T.

The proposal, known as the Imangara Language Project, was designed to keep the Alyawarre language strong at Imangara. The application proposed to build up the material resources in the Alyawarre language through the use of audio and video equipment and to assist community people become literate in their own language. Literacy classes were also to be developed with accounts, administration and organization conducted through the Tennant Creek Language Centre. However the requested continuing funding of $12,130 was deferred by the Panel until late 1989. The report on the project although due on 21 May 1989 had not been received by the time the Panel considered the application [June 21 1989]

KEPPEL ISLANDER LIFESTYLES ABORIGINAL CORPORATION, QLD.

The proposal, known as the Keppel Island Project, was designed to save the Darumbol language as there were only two speakers left both in their seventies. The requested funding of $12,670, however, was not supported even though the project had initially been provided with funds in the 1987/88 round. The Panel stated that they were not prepared to continue to support the project as no language had been recorded and argued there was no one left who still knew it. Moreover, the project was seen as supporting the tourism industry rather than language revival.

KIJA LANGUAGE GROUP, TURKEY CREEK, KIMBERLEY, W.A.

The proposal, known as Keeping Kija Language Strong, was to maintain the Kija language in the Warrmarn Community. The group planned to involve more community members in the language program and to strengthen the existing Kija program by using a computer to produce books and other curriculum and teaching materials. The project was school based. However the requested funding of $27,800 was not supported by the Panel which noted that the submission was for the same language as that requested

from the Warrmarn Community. The Panel opted for the Community proposal as it was seen as better conceived and seemed to have attracted more community support. The Kija Language Group were advised to work with the Warrmarn Community.

MUNGKARTA COMMUNITY, TENNANT CREEK, N.T.

The proposal, known as the Mungkarta Language Project, was designed to maintain the Alyawarre language and to continue to provide the Assistant Teacher at the Jurnkurrakurr Aboriginal Resource Centre with language and culture materials. The Tennant Creek Language Centre was to provide administrative assistance, organise special courses and allow access to its vehicle and equipment. However, the requested funding of $19,994 was not supported by the Panel on the basis that the project had made a slow start and as such would not be jeopardised if funding was considered in late 1989. The Panel agreed to reconsider the application at that time.

NGOONBI COOPERATIVE, KURANDA, QUEENSLAND.

The proposal, known as the Djabugay Project, was to provide for a Djabugay teacher; the establishment of a Regional Language Centre, and the development of materials for use by school students. The Djabugay language was in danger of dying with only three people speaking it in the community and possibly twenty five in total. However, the requested funding of $30,700 was not supported by the Panel. It noted that the project proposed to use the same Instructor as that proposed by Djabugay Gul and Language Resource Centre and that the proposal was not as well thought out. The Panel funded Djabugay Gul in preference to Ngoonbi Cooperative.

NGUKURR ADULT EDUCATION COMMITTEE

We are uncertain of what this project entailed as we have not received the submission. However, according to the NALP Minutes the requested funding of $17,300 was not supported by the Panel at this time. the Panel noted that the final report from the first year's funding was not due until 13 October 1989. It was agreed that there was a need to visit Ngukurr to evaluate the program in person rather than through a written report. It was decided to reconsider the application once the final report had been received and a panel member had visited the project.

NYLETTE CORPORATION, ATHERTON, QUEENSLAND.

The proposal, known as Yidijn Language Revival, was to provide people with access to the Yidijn language [of which there was only ten known speakers] and to preserve the language for the future. The proposal envisaged one writer compiling a series of key words and meanings and to incorporate them into a story book of the Yidijn

people's legends. The proposal asked the Panel to suggest where they would like further details to be provided. However, the requested funding of $13,820 was not supported on the basis that the proposal provided no information on how the project would be carried out and the processes that would be involved.

PARNNGURR ABORIGINAL COMMUNITY, NEWMAN, W.A.

The proposal, known as the Parnngurr Language Project, was to record and write stories in Manyjilyjarra and Kartujarra; to develop materials for use in the Parngurr Community School and to make audio and video tapes for the community. However, the requested funding of $11,000 was not supported as the Panel considered there were other sources of funding for writing stories.

SOUTHERN ABORIGINAL CORPORATION, ALBANY, W.A.

The proposal, known as the Noongar Language Revival Project, was to record and prepare a book of the Noongar language; to prepare materials for educational instruction and to give personal instruction in the Noongar language. However, the requested funding of $49,910 was not supported on the basis of NALP's limited resources. The Corporation was advised to contact the Bunbury Aboriginal Progress Association which was undertaking work on the language through NALP funding.

TARDUN PARENT COUNCIL, MULLEWA, W.A.

The proposal, known as the Watjarri Language Renewal Program, was to plan and carry out a research program to identify community members with knowledge of the Watjarri language; conduct recorded interviews, and produce a Watjarri Language Teaching Package. However, the requested funding of $13,665 was not supported on the basis that the Panel considered the Watjarri proposal in Geraldton to be better. Moreover, the Geraldton project had been asked to undertake the research that the Tardun Parents Council had requested.

YARRABAH COMMUNITY COUNCIL, YARRABAH, QUEENSLAND.

The proposal was for the maintenance of the Gungay language and had school and community support. However, the requested funding of $13,676 was not supported by the Panel as it considered the proposal looked like a "shopping list" of equipment for the school. The Council was invited to provide an explanation of how the equipment would be used to support language maintenance and also provide information on the proposed language maintenance processes. The Panel deferred funding until the next round.

ADULT EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS

AUSTRALIAN NATIONAL UNIVERSITY, CANBERRA, A.C.T.

The requested funding of $50,000 was not supported by the Panel on the basis that "..it did not seem to be appropriate for NALP funding at this stage". The Panel also considered that Professor Dixon should liaise with the Aboriginal Languages Association with regard to the project.

BATCHELOR COLLEGE, BATCHELOR, N.T.

The College submitted three proposals which were to establish an Aboriginal Language Resource Centre on the College campus; to support Community based research into Aboriginal languages and language/education issues; and to develop language material production and training. The requested funding of $214,345 was rejected on the grounds that the Assessment Panel believed the proposals fell outside the NALP guidelines. The panel was of the opinion that the College was eligible for funding through the RATE program and Special Course funding provisions. No separate details regarding the Panel's rejection of the three proposals are available.

INSTITUTE FOR ABORIGINAL DEVELOPMENT, ALICE SPRINGS, N.T.

The proposal was to prepare and publish a Warlpiri/ English Dictionary. The requested funding of $7,820 was rejected as the Panel considered that substantial work had already been undertaken on Warlpiri.

KALGOORLIE COLLEGE, KALGOORLIE, W.A.

The proposal known as the Wangkatja Intensive Course and the Wangkatja Weekly Classes was to have developed an intensive introductory Wangkatja course for public servants, teachers and others working in the Western Desert together with weekly classes for students enrolled at members of the wider community. The requested funding of $12,798 was not supported on the grounds that Wangkatja was not the local community language and that the language was to have been taught by a European.

PUNDULMURRA COLLEGE, PORT HEDLAND, WA.

The proposal was initially submitted for funding under the Multicultural and Cross Cultural Supplementation Program [MACSP], another program funded through AACLAME. It was referred to NALP as it was considered to be outside the guidelines for MACSP. The requested funding

of $44,000 was not supported as the Panel considered that the College should apply for Western Australian TAFE funding for the project.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN COLLEGE OF ADVANCED EDUCATION, ADELAIDE, S.A.

The proposal known as the South Australian Aboriginal Languages Project was submitted through the Aboriginal Studies and Teacher Education Unit. The requested funding of $79,530 was to survey the Aboriginal languages situation in South Australia; revise existing language kits; develop and publish other language kits and to assist with other resources developments. The project was rejected on the grounds that it lacked Aboriginal involvement.

UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA, PERTH, W.A.

The proposal, submitted by the University's Department of Education, was to provide a system for the maintenance and revival of Aboriginal languages using microcomputers in order that sight and sound senses could be used in the language teaching process. The project was to involve the languages of the Goldfields. The requested funding of $58,609 was not supported as the proposal showed no evidence of Aboriginal involvement.

PRIVATE COMPANIES

CO-ORDATA RESEARCH, KIRWAN, QUEENSLAND.

The above organization submitted three proposals. These proposals included the development of writing, editing and translating skills; the establishment of basic skills in language recording and retrieval; the compilation of dictionaries and the writing of sketch analyses of the grammar of various languages. Of the nine languages proposed within the submissions eight had less than ten speakers. The requested funding of $85,385 was rejected on the grounds that the proposal was considered to be of lower priority than others.

PITJANTJATJARA-YANKUNYTJATJARA MEDIA, ERNABELLA, NT.

The proposal was to record dreaming stories, songs and dances on video and to edit and produce these stories for local videotape distribution and community television broadcast. However, the requested funding of $38,000 was not supported as the Panel considered the proposal to be outside NALP guidelines. It felt that the media company should work with Imparja Television and the Aboriginal Arts Board.

WARLPIRI MEDIA ASSOCIATION INC. YUENDUMU, NT.

The proposal, known as the Warlpiri Language Video Project, was initially funded by NALP in August 1988 [$23,372]. The length of the project was put at two to three years. A progress report on the project was submitted in November 1988 indicated that the project had commenced some four months previously and was already suffering a budget overrun of over $1,000. Further funding was required to complete the project. The requested funding of $31,930 was for the local production of Warlpiri language video material and the provision of training and employment for Warlpiri people in video production. The additional funding request was not supported by the Panel as it considered the aims of the project to be outside NALP guidelines. The Panel suggested the Association apply for funding through DAA, Aboriginal Arts Board or other DEET sources. It also suggested that the Association work closely with CAAMA.

PRIVATE INDIVIDUALS

DIGBY DUNCAN, CAMPERDOWN, NEW SOUTH WALES.

The proposal was to produce a thirty minute film/video about the Warlpiri language and to provide film making experience to two or more Warlpiri people. The project had the support in principle of the Warlpiri Media Association. There was also the possibility of the film being screened on Imparja Television. However, the requested funding of $93,277 was not supported as the Panel considered it to be of low priority.

DENNIS BANNISTER, BRISBANE, QUEENSLAND.

The proposal was to provide schools with a brief but factual account of local Aboriginal languages. However, the applicant did not provided adequate information in his application and the proposal was subsequently rejected.

APPENDIX FIVE

PLACES AND ORGANIZATIONS VISITED DURING THE REVIEW

The following thirty five places were visited by the Review Team.

Aboriginal Education Consultative Group [NSW]
Adelaide Area [South Australia Education Department]
Alice Springs Catholic High School [NT]
Batchelor College [NT]
Belyuen Community, Adult Education Centre [NT]
Bidyadanga Community, La Grange Primary School [WA]
Bunbury Regional Progress Association [WA]
Central Australian Aboriginal Media Association (NT)
Djabugay Gu:l School and Language Resource Centre [QLD]
Doon Doon Primary School [WA]
Geraldton Regional Community Education Centre [WA]
Gumbaynggirr Language and Culture Group [NSW]
Gurungu Council Aboriginal Corporation [NT]
Institute of Aboriginal Development, Alice Springs, [NT]
Jarndu Yawuru Women's Group [WA]
Kaurna Plains School [SA]
Kimberley Language Resource Centre, Halls Creek [WA]
Kimberley Language Resource Centre, Fitzroy Crossing [WA]
Kombumerri Aboriginal Corporation, Southport [QLD]
Kuranda School and Community [QLD]
Kwombom Aboriginal Corporation [WA]
Magabala Books [WA]
Mirima Council [WA]
Mossman Gorge Aboriginal Community [QLD]
Murray Island State School [QLD]
Nguiu/Bathurst Island Council [NT]
Nguiu Nginingawila Literature Production Centre [NT]
Nyinkkanyunyu School Council [NT]
Pilbara Aboriginal Language Centre [WA]
Pundulmurra College [WA]
Queensland University [QLD]
Strelley Community School [WA]
Thursday Island High School [QLD]
Warrmarn Community [WA]
Yipirinya School [NT]

APPENDIX SIX

INDIVIDUALS CONSULTED DURING THE REVIEW

The following 176 people were consulted in relation to the National Aboriginal Languages Program. Those marked * are Aboriginal people.

ADELAIDE AREA [SOUTH AUSTRALIA EDUCATION DEPARTMENT]

Rod Sheridan	Principal, Croydon Primary School
Rob Amery	Linguist/Co-Ordinator
Greg Wilson	Language Teacher
*Nelson Varcoe	Language Teacher
*Josie Agius	Project Officer
Kathy Gale	Project Officer

ALICE SPRINGS CATHOLIC HIGH SCHOOL

Brother John Dyson	Principal
Mike Bowden	Co-ordinator of Ntyarlke Unit
Helena Monoghan	Language Co-ordinator
*Shirley Turner	Year 10 Arrente Student
*Margaret Mary	Language Worker

BATCHELOR COLLEGE

Paul Black	Linguist, SAL
Michael Cook	Linguist, SAL
Neil Chadwick	Linguist, SAL

BELYUEN COMMUNITY ADULT EDUCATION CENTRE

Lys Ford	Linguist

BIDYADANGA COMMUNITY

John Newman	Primary School Principal
*Yanawana Nyapuru	Aboriginal Education Worker
*Purtungana Bangu	Aboriginal Education Worker
Jane Wilkie	Teacher Years 1-2
Coralie Walker	Teacher Years 3-4
Dave Leslie	Teacher Years 5-7
Tracy Mathews	Pre-primary Teacher
Dean Finlay	High School Teacher
Glennis Newman	High School Teacher
Sr. Johanna Klep	Religious Adviser
*Djan	Language Worker
*Sally	Language Worker
*Ronnie	Language Worker
*Margaret	Language Worker
*Nellie	Language Worker
*Jack	Language Worker

*John	Language Worker
*Bella	Language Worker
*Edna	Language Worker
*Elsie	Language Worker
*Rosie	Language Worker
*Janie	Language Worker
*Paddy	Language Worker
*Mangala	Language Worker
*Ging	Language Worker
*Dundora	Language Worker
*Nancy	Language Worker
*Maureen	Language Worker

BUNBURY ABORIGINAL PROGRESS ASSOCIATION

*Raymond Dann	President
Sandra Wooltorton	Project Co-ordinator
*Glenys Collard	Fieldworker
*Dean Wynne	Liaison Officer
Robyn McCarron	Aboriginal Enclave Co-ordinator
Kathy Bell	Lecturer
*Kathy Jetta	Student
*Gloria Dann	Student
*Fay Farmer	Student
Steve Bark	Student
*Linda Quartermaine	Student

CENTRAL AUSTRALIAN ABORIGINAL MEDIA ASSOCIATION

*Lorna Wilson	Co-ordinator of Language Services
*Robbie Thornton	Acting Manager, Radio

DEPARTMENT OF EMPLOYMENT EDUCATION AND TRAINING, CANBERRA

Chris Robinson	Assistant Secretary
Greg Miller	Director of Schooling Strategy
*Percy Knight	NALP Co-ordinator
Chris O'Connor	Public Servant
Vanessa Elwell-Gavins	Public Servant

DJABUGAY GU:L SCHOOL AND LANGUAGE RESOURCE CENTRE

Michael Quinn	Teacher/LInguist
*Clive Dixon	Principal, Kuranda Primary School
*Rhonda Duffin	Kuranda Community Member
*Joyce Riley	Kuranda Community Member
*Gaynor Hunter	Kuranda Community Member
*Rosetta Brim	Mantaka Community Member
*Sherry-Anne Diamond	Mantaka Community Member

DOON DOON PRIMARY SCHOOL

Jarred Haydn-Smith	Acting Principal

GERALDTON REGIONAL COMMUNITY EDUCATION CENTRE

Gary Evershed	Director
Mary Callaghan	Aboriginal Education Consultant, Ministry of Education
Julie Brockman	Geraldton Regional Aboriginal Medical Service Administrator

*Gabby Willaway	Economic and Employment Development Officer, Department of Employment and Training
*Coral Brockman	Aboriginal Liaison Officer, Ministry of Education

GUMBAYNGIRR LANGUAGE AND CULTURE GROUP

*A. Pacey	Gumbaynggirr Elder
Steve Morelli	Christian Brother
*Mary Button	Aboriginal Education Assistant
C. Fuhrman	Education Resource Teacher
*P. Corey	Scripture Teacher

GURUNGU COUNCIL ABORIGINAL CORPORATION

*Mark Raymond	Gurungu Council President
Kerry Gardiner	Adult Educator
*Lyle Johnson	NALP Panel Member
*Heather Wilson	Assistant Teacher, Elliot Primary

IMPARJA TELEVISION

*Freda Glynn	General Manager
Phillip Batty	Deputy General Manager

JARNDU YAWURU WOMEN'S GROUP

*Theresa Barker	Co-ordinator
*Patricia Torres	Member

INDIVIDUALS

Jo Lo Bianco	Chairperson, AACLAME
*Kathy Trimmer	Chairperson, NALP
Joyce Hudson	Consultant Linguist
Annette Schmidt	Linguist
Patrick McConvell	Academic/Linguist
M. Phillips	Injilinji Community Member
*Henrietta Fourmile	ALA, Brisbane
*Shirley Foley	President, Thoorghine Culture Centre
*Kaye Mundine	Regional Director, Human Rights Commission, Brisbane,

INSTITUTE FOR ABORIGINAL DEVELOPMENT

Anne Davies	Co-ordinator, Language Department
Robert Hoogenraad	Consultant, Northern Territory Education Department
John Henderson	Co-ordinator, Arrente Dictionary Language Program

KAURNA PLAINS SCHOOL

Tony Wakefield	Transition Education Co-ordinator

KIMBERLEY LANGUAGE RESOURCE CENTRE, HALLS CREEK

Sally Thomas	Co-ordinator
Mathew Wrigley	Linguist
*Geraldine Demi	Secretary
*Eileen Walagie	Chairperson

KIMBERLEY LANGUAGE RESOURCE CENTRE, FITZROY CROSSING

Barbara Jones	Linguist
*Josie Farrer	Aboriginal Language Worker

KOMBUMERRI ABORIGINAL CORPORATION

Pat O'Connor	Co-ordinator

KWOMBOM ABORIGINAL CORPORATION

Ellen Sullivan	Language Speaker

MAGABALA BOOKS

Peter Bibby	Editor

MIRIMA COUNCIL, KUNUNURRA

Susan Whillis	Co-ordinator
*Ben Ward	Chairman
*Blondie Hunter	Community Member
*David Newry	Vice President
*Daisey Jundum	Community Elder

MOSSMAN GORGE ABORIGINAL COMMUNITY

Dennis Field	Pastor, Christian Bretheren
Graham Cockburn	Language Teacher, Mossman High
*Norm Walker	Elder, Mossman
*Muriel Eddleston	Community Education Counsellor

MURRAY ISLAND STATE SCHOOL

Gary Finlay	Principal
*Cedric Gisu	Teacher
*Aurie Marou	Teacher
*Ken Passi	Language Co-ordinator
*James Sambo	Language Teacher
*Segar Passi	Artist
*Guneur Blanco	Language Teacher
*Ron Day	Council Chairperson
*Sam Passi	Community Member
*Del Passi	Community Member
Jayne Finlay	Community Member

NSW ABORIGINAL EDUCATION CONSULTATIVE GROUP

*Linda Burney	President
Deidre Ferguson	Research Officer

NGUIU/BATHURST ISLAND COUNCIL

*Marita Pilakui	Liaison Officer for Catholic School and Community
Sr. Anne Gardiner	Principal
*Geraldine Tungutalum	Story Teller
*Monicia Timaepatua	Story Teller
*Donald Kantilla	Story Teller
*Edward Portaminni	Story Teller
*Bertrem Kantilla	Story Teller

NGUIU NGININGAWILA LITERATURE PRODUCTION CENTRE

Sr. Teresa Ward	Teacher/Linguist

PAPULU APARR-KARI LANGUAGE RESOURCE CENTRE

*Lyle Johnson	Co-ordinator
*Jeanie Bell	Consultant
*Linda Turner	Trainee Co-ordinator

PILBARA ABORIGINAL LANGUAGE CENTRE

Nicholas Thieberger	Linguist/Co-ordinator
Mathew Wrigley	Visiting Linguist
*Lorraine Injie	Researcher

PUNDULMURRA COLLEGE

Geoff Harris	Acting Principal
Janet Sharp	Teacher Linguist
Mark Simpson	On-site Courses Co-ordinator

QUEENSLAND UNIVERSITY

*Allan Sambono	Director, Aboriginal and Islander Studies Unit
*Bella Swann	Academic Counsellor
*James Williams	Student
*Gina Whap	Student
*Noritta Morseu	Student

STRELLEY COMMUNITY SCHOOL

John Bucknall	Aboriginal Education Consultant
Gwenn Bucknall	Aboriginal Education Consultant

THURSDAY ISLAND HIGH SCHOOL

Wayne Webster	Deputy Principal
*Romina Fuji	Community Education Counsellor
John Singe	Teacher
*Lency Singe	Teachers Aide

THURSDAY ISLAND STATE SCHOOL

Geoff Moor	Principal

VICTORIA, STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

*Wendy Morris	Deputy Chair, Aboriginal Languages Project Steering Committee.

WARRMARN COMMUNITY

*Ethel McLennon	Community Development Co-ordinator
*Frank Budbaria	Councillor
*Queenie McKenzie	Councillor
*Bob Nyalcas	Ex Council Chairman
*Violet Winnie	Councillor
*Peggy Patrick	Visiting from Doon Doon Community
*John Patrick	Visiting from Doon Doon Community

YIPIRINYA SCHOOL COUNCIL

*Harold Furber	Administration Co-ordinator

APPENDIX SEVEN

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies [1984] "Research Grants: Information and Conditions for Applicants" Canberra.

Cooke, M. [1988] "Aboriginal Languages Fortnight - Guide for Participants

Department of Employment, Education and Training, [1988] "National Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Education Policy", DRAFT, Canberra.

Geraldton Regional Community Education Centre 1988 Annual Report.

Hughes, P. [1988] "Report of the Aboriginal Education Policy Task Force", AGPS, Canberra: Department of Employment, Education and Training.

House of Representatives Select Committee on Aboriginal Education: Ruddock, P.M. Hand, G.L.; and Blanchard,C.A.: Chairpersons. [1985] "Aboriginal Education Report of the House of Representatives Select Committee on Aboriginal Education". AGPS, Canberra.

Irruluma Guruluwini Enemburu (A.I. Brown), [1989] "Koori English", State Board of Education, Victoria.

Lo Bianco, J. [1987] "National Policy on Languages", AGPS, Canberra: Commonwealth Department of Education.

McConvell, P. [1987] Aboriginal Language Needs - How To Deliver. Unpublished Paper.

McConvell, P. [1988] Review of School of Australian Linguistics. Unpublished Paper.

Ministerial Working Party on the Development of a Policy for the Teaching of Languages Other Than English [LOTE] in Western Australian Schools: Kaldor, S. and Malcolm, I. Joint Chairpersons. [1988] "Languages for Western Australians. Report of the Ministerial Working Party on the Development of a Policy for the Teaching of Languages Other Than English [LOTE] in Western Australian Schools", Ministry for Education, Perth.

Ministerial Working Party on the State Language Policy: Lewis, R. Chairperson. [1988] "Report of the Ministerial